

THE
**SOCIALIST
STANDARD**

1929

THE Socialist Standard

The Official Organ of **THE SOCIALIST PARTY** of Great Britain.

No. 293. Vol. 25.]

LONDON, JANUARY, 1929.

[MONTHLY, TWOPENCE.]

WHAT IS THE USE OF PARLIAMENT?

LESSONS OF THE GERMAN NAVAL REVOLT.

Those who have learned by experience and observation that the big political parties, Liberal, Labour and Conservative alike, offer no hope of improved conditions for the workers, often conclude that the failure of these Parliamentary parties is evidence of the uselessness of Parliament and the danger of Parliamentary methods. This is a wrong conclusion. It is not Parliament as a piece of political machinery which has failed; it is the three political parties which have failed. They have failed even to attempt to use Parliament for the purpose of establishing Socialism. No single M.P. of any party in this country has ever been elected to Parliament as a Socialist, for the simple reason that there is no single constituency in which a majority of the workers want Socialism. We say that when the workers are Socialists and are organised in the Socialist Party, they will use their votes to obtain control of Parliament because this will give control of all the machinery of administration and control of the armed forces. While the Capitalist class have control of Parliament and the Army, Navy, Air Force, etc., their position is secure and we are helpless.

Some of our critics question this view. They say that it is unnecessary and useless to obtain control of Parliament. Unnecessary because the workers can themselves gain military dominance by force of arms and by winning over the existing armed forces; and useless because control of Parliament does not give power over the armed forces. The possibility of the working class organising their own military force has often and recently been dealt with in these

columns. It is an illusion and a dangerous illusion.

Our attitude on the second question, the power of Parliament, is worth some elaboration. In the modern Capitalist democracies the State has come to control a vast, intricate and continually growing machinery of administration. Not only does it control legislation—the making of laws—but also their administration by hundreds of thousands of civil servants and local government officials, and their enforcement by the courts, the police and, in the last resort, by the armed forces. Every phase of modern life, the ownership and transfer of property, the production of wealth, transport, building, commercial and financial operations, education, hospitals, sanitation, public health, all these activities are carried on under regulations prescribed by the Government and, in the final analysis, under conditions which they determine. The life of modern Capitalist society is organised round Parliament as its centre of power. Parliamentary control carries with it the power, more or less directly and speedily, to promote or suspend activity in any and every branch of social life. By organisation and by use, the electorate—now the vast majority of the adult population—look to Parliament as the depository of the organised power of society, and by law, by organisation and use, the employees, civil and military, of the central and local authorities derive their authority from the Government which, in turn, is dependent on a Parliamentary majority.

Each individual in this great civil and

military machine goes on doing his particular job under the authority of the official or officer above him in the scale. Legally, neither a civil servant nor a soldier can plead in defence of an illegal action that he was obeying the orders of his superior, but within the framework of the law each man realises that his position and security are guaranteed so long, and only so long, as he acts with such superior authority. Should occasions arise when instant obedience is required to an order the legality of which is in doubt, the man concerned can only use his own judgment as to whether or not the final authority, the Government, will back him up in the course he chooses. This is simple when the general attitude and intentions of the Government are well known. Each individual is a part of the machine and everything is done to cultivate immediate response to decisions of the central authority. This is why the soldier will normally face almost certain death rather than the penalty, possibly less severe but absolutely certain, which will follow if he takes the very difficult step of acting on his own initiative in defiance of orders.

By its very nature, however, this elaborate machine weakens and fails if there is an obvious weakening or disunity at the centre of things. If a Government fails to act decisively in an emergency, or, having taken a decision, reverses it, or allows subordinate military or civil authorities, or even some of its own members, to act on their own responsibility in defiance of its decisions, if any of these things happen the individuals who make up the Army, and less urgently the civil servants, are put in a state of confusion or are faced with the difficult problem of having to choose between rival authorities, with the possibility of backing the weaker of the two. In the case of a subordinate civil or military official defying the supreme authority, the decision of the soldier or civil servant is not in doubt. He backs the supreme authority. Where it is the Government itself which is divided or paralysed, his natural course is to take no decision at all if it can be avoided. Hence the failure of authority and decision at the top immediately affects the morale and effectiveness of the whole machine.

It is to obtain this enormous advantage given by possession of the central directing machinery, and the authority resulting from

control of Parliament, that Socialists seek to gain a Parliamentary majority.

A useful illustration of the importance of such control is given by the revolt in Germany in 1918, which resulted in a regrouping of the Capitalist governing circles, and the dropping of the Kaiser and the Monarchy, figureheads which had outgrown their usefulness.

In 1918 it had for a year been increasingly obvious to more and more persons influential in German political and industrial life, that the Allies must win the war. There was as much, and probably much more, war-weariness among the civilian and the fighting population than in the chief Allied countries, but in Germany, as here, the practice of keeping the Government and Parliament in touch with public opinion by means of elections and more or less free speech and a free press, had ceased to operate in the ordinary peace-time fashion. Capitalist opinion on the War was more divided than at any time since 1914, and those who favoured peace at almost any price were able to bring their views to bear directly on the Government. Acute differences of opinion among prominent politicians were openly expressed and debated. The new Government, under the Chancellorship of Prince Max of Baden, had for some time in the autumn of 1918 been negotiating for an armistice.

More than a year earlier, in the summer of 1917, there had been determined efforts to stir up the German sailors to mutiny, and there were, in fact, outbreaks on various ships. At that time, however, the German Government was still fairly representative of the mass of the population, and still united on the determined prosecution of the War. In consequence, the revolt failed to spread and was easily stamped out.

By October, 1918, the situation had vastly changed. Prince Max personally had favoured the opening of negotiations a year before, and his appointment as Chancellor signified the growing influence of the Capitalist interests whose views on the question of peace had the backing of a majority of the population. (At the elections shortly afterwards the German Labour Party alone secured nearly 50 per cent. of votes, and there were other parties as well which had dropped their earlier enthusiasm for the War.) Thus Germany had a

Government still carrying on the War, but with members some of whom were known to be lukewarm in their enthusiasm for it. In these circumstances the German admirals, including Von Scheer, the "Victor" of Jutland, who was now Chief of the Admiralty Staff at Berlin, drew up plans for a great naval action by the whole German Fleet. (See obituary notices and articles on Von Scheer in "Manchester Guardian," "Daily News" and "Daily Express," November 27th, 1928; "Manchester Guardian," October 30th, 1928; and for a general account see "Die Tragodie der alten deutschen marine," by E. Alboldt, Berlin.) The officers were willing and eager, but many of the crew, as in 1917, were dissatisfied and tired of the War. The order was given on October 29th for the Fleet to put to sea on the following day, and in spite of the desperate nature of this last attempt to smash the Allied naval supremacy, the order would have been obeyed, like innumerable other desperate war-time orders, if the decision had had behind it the unimpaired weight of the supreme authority, the German Government. It became known, however, that the German naval authorities, both the admirals afloat and the naval staff, had acted without the knowledge and consent of Prince Max and the Government. The minority of active revolutionary and anti-war propagandists among the crew thus had, and seized, a decisive argument which they had lacked in 1917. The thousands of sailors who would passively go to almost certain death on the order of the Government because it was in accordance with political habit and training to do so, would not raise a finger on the unauthorised command of their superior officers or the supreme naval staff. The order was withdrawn on October 31st, but the authority of the whole naval disciplinary system was broken. The news spread, and opposition to the War and to the Kaiser and politicians who still favoured war was openly expressed among the soldiers and the civilian population. Within a fortnight the Armistice had been arranged. The Kaiser abdicated, and new elections in due course gave full power to a Coalition Government including the German Labour Party united and possessing authority which Prince Max's Government lacked. The new Coalition was strong enough to take in hand the crushing of the

small minority of Socialists and to reform the German Constitution on the lines desired by the Capitalist interests which had risen to the top in place of those which had been dominant in 1914.

H.

ANSWERS TO CORRESPONDENTS.

E. M. (Brixton) writes at length, denying that a majority of the workers will ever understand Socialism, as before our propaganda will penetrate the workers' minds. Most of them will be submerged into the slum proletariat—and beyond redemption altogether.

The views put forward—as to the slowness of accepting Socialism and the workers' large interest in Capitalist ideas—are not new, and they were faced long ago. But the notion that general industrial development and economic pressure does not make the workers receptive to Socialism, is belied by the facts of daily experience.

One fact alone—the widespread interest in social affairs and social change, compared to 25 years ago—is patent to all. It does not follow from Capitalist development that most workers will be pushed into the slum proletariat.

The important facts to bear in mind are the growing insecurity of "jobs," even salaried ones, the lessons of concentration of wealth going on all around us, and the proved inefficacy of the reform panaceas to affect the workers' lives for the better. The long history of workers' struggles against enormous odds proves that even the lies and chloroform of the masters fail to work in face of the glaring lessons from economic life.

EDIT. COM.

EAST LONDON.

A LECTURE

ON

SOCIALISM

AT

CIRCLE HOUSE, 67, ALIE STREET,
ALDGATE,

On Sunday, January 27th, at 7.30 p.m.

Speaker - J. GINSBERG.

Admission Free.

Questions and Discussion.

SOCIOLOGY OF EIGHTEENTH CENTURY FRENCH DRAMA.

By G. V. PLECHANOV.

PART II—continued

A child of the aristocracy, the classic tragedy, unlimitedly and indisputably reigned on the French stage while the aristocracy predominated socially in the bounds assigned by the constitutional monarchy, which itself was a historic result of the lasting and embittered struggle of classes in France. When the supreme position of the aristocracy began to be a subject of dispute, when people of "the middle state" were possessed of a rebellious frame of mind, the extant literary conceptions began to appear to these people unsatisfactory, and the old theatre not instructive enough. And then, simultaneous with the gradual fall of the classic tragedy, the bourgeois drama made itself evident. In the bourgeois drama the French "man of middle state" set his family virtues against the deeply-spoiled aristocracy. But that social contradiction, which France then had to solve, could not be decided by the aid of moral preaching. The subject was then not about the removal of aristocratic vices, but the removal of the aristocracy itself. It is understood that this could not come to pass without embittered struggle, and it is not less clear that the father of the family, in all fervent esteem of his bourgeois morality, could not serve as the model of an untiring and intrepid martyr. The literary portrayal of the bourgeoisie did not inspire heroism. And yet the opponents of the old order felt the need of heroism, were conscious of the necessity of the development of civic virtues in the Third Estate. Where was it possible, then, to find models of such virtue? There — where they searched before for standards of literary taste: in the ancient world.

So again the reversion to heroes of the old civilisations. Now the opponent of the aristocracy says no more — like Beaumarchais — "Of what concern to me, a citizen of a monarchical state of the eighteenth century, are the events of Athens and Rome?" Now the Athenian and Roman events re-awakened in the public the liveliest interest. But this interest took on another character.

If the young ideologists of the bourgeoisie were interested now in sacrificing a young

princess of Aulis, they were interested in it mainly as a source of material for revealing superstition; if their attention could be attracted by the "death of some Peloponnesian tyrant," then this attraction was due, not so much to its psychologic as its political side. Nor were they attracted by the monarchical age of August, but by the republican heroes of Plutarch. Plutarch became the text-book of the young bourgeois ideologists, as the memoirs of Mme. Rolland show. And this love for the republican heroes once more revived an interest in ancient life. Imitation of antiquity became the fashion, and it put a deep imprint upon all French art of the time. We shall note that, in addition, this same imitation weakened the interest in the bourgeois drama, because of the prosaicism of its substance, and for a long time delayed the death of the classic tragedy.

Historians of French literature frequently have asked themselves in surprise: what is the explanation of the fact that the plotters and workers of the great French Revolution remained conservatives in the domain of literature? And why did classicism fall only a long time after the fall of the old order? But in reality the literary conservatism of the innovators of that time was only external. If tragedy did not change as a form, then it suffered a necessary change in the matter of content.

Let us take *Spartacus*, the tragedy of Sorraïne, which appeared in 1760. Its hero, Spartacus, is full of yearning for freedom. For the sake of his great idea he even refuses to marry the girl he loves, and all through the play he continues to talk about freedom and humanity. In order to write such tragedies and praise them, it was absolutely essential that one be not a literary conservative. An entirely new and revolutionary substance was poured into the old literary leather flasks.

Tragedies like those of Sorraïne and Lemverre exemplify one of the most revolutionary demands of the literary innovator Diderot: they depict, not characters, but social conditions; and especially the revolutionary social tendencies of the time. And if this new wine was poured into old leather flasks, then it is to be explained by the fact that these leather flasks were overshadowed by the same antiquity, the general love for which was one of the most significant, most characteristic symptoms of the new social

POINTS FOR PROPAGANDISTS.

THE WORKERS' SAVINGS.

In the early days of Capitalism it was possible for the man with small capital to set up in business with some chance of climbing to the top, and in consequence saving ranked high among the Capitalist virtues. Out of this developed the silly theory that the possession of wealth in the modern world denotes "abstinence" and "self-denial" on the part of the possessing class. It was effectively answered by the late Sir William Ashley, economic adviser to the Conservative Party. In his "Economic Organisation of England" (p. 157) he says:—

Phrases like these have occasioned no little mirth; it is hard to discover self-denial or parsimony as the world understands these words, in the processes by which modern capital is most largely accumulated.

Capitalist savings result mainly, not from self-denial, but from having incomes so large that it is difficult not to save. Knowing this, and overlooking the fact that the position of the workers is essentially different from their own, it is a common error for wealthy bankers and Cabinet Ministers to assume that the accumulation of funds in savings banks indicates prosperity among the workers. Every wage-earner appreciates only too well that the necessity of putting something by, out of wages already inadequate for decent comfort, is the result not of prosperity, but of the insecurity of his existence. It is therefore interesting to see that Major-General J. E. B. Seely, Chairman of the National Savings Committee, has realised this. In a speech at Leeds on December 12th he said that in November, 1928, more Savings Certificates had been sold than in any November since 1921.

As unemployment and distress grow, savings have increased. The reason is that the British people, when they are up against something, are determined to lay something up against the dangers looming ahead. Households now living on 30s. a week are saving more than they did when they were earning £7 or £8 a week. ("Daily Mail," 13 December.)

And what a commentary on Capitalism. Here we have one of the wealthiest ruling classes known to history financing a huge national organisation in order to persuade its wage-slaves, starving on 30s. a week, that they ought to save!

mood. Side by side with the diverse types of the classic tragedy, according to Beaumarchais, the bourgeois drama could not but seem too poor, too insipid, too conservative in its content.

The bourgeois drama was brought to life by the opposite attitude of the French bourgeoisie, and no longer was suitable for the expression of its revolutionary inclination. The literary portrayal accurately defined the transition of the bourgeois; therefore the characterisations ceased being interesting when the bourgeoisie lost these features and when these features ceased to seem pleasant.

The classic tragedy existed close to the time when the French bourgeoisie finally triumphed over the defenders of the new order, and when the love for the republican heroes of antiquity lost all social significance for the bourgeoisie. And when this time came, the bourgeois drama received new impetus, and suffered some necessary changes according to the peculiarities of the new social condition, but these changes were not important nor definite enough to prevent the drama's asserting itself on the French stage.

Even those who refused to acknowledge any consanguineous relation between the romantic drama and the bourgeois drama of the eighteenth century would have to agree that the dramatic productions of, for instance, the son of Alexandre Dumas represent the bourgeois drama of the nineteenth century.

In the productions of art and literary tastes of a given time is expressed the social psychology; and in the psychology of a society which is divided into classes much will remain vague and paradoxical to us if we continue to ignore—as the historical idealists do, despite the best intentions of the bourgeois historical scientists—the mutual relation of classes and the class struggle.

(Translated for *Modern Quarterly* by Bessie Peretz.)

(Concluded.)

BOOKS RECEIVED.

Why Anglo-Russian Diplomatic Relations Should be Restored. — W. P. COATES.
Anglo-Russian Parliamentary Committee. 1/-

YOUR newsagent can obtain the "Socialist Standard" through the wholesalers, W. H. Smith & Son. Ask him to get your copy, but if you have any difficulty send direct to 17, Mount Pleasant, London W.C.1.

STATEMENTS OF FACT.

There are, perhaps, different standards of accuracy and reliability observed by different Governments and newspapers, but during the War every Government and the Press of every belligerent country was engaged in faking and suppressing news, as well as in downright lying. In consequence, most people are inclined to be sceptical about some, if not all, of the "facts" they read, especially if they are "official."

So much so, that the "Daily News" on November 28th referred to the numerous letters received by all the newspapers, asking if the bulletins about the King's illness were genuine or whether something was being kept back. The "Daily News," as usual a little pompous, informed its readers in heavy black type as follows:—

"The Daily News"—speaking with high authority—feels it a duty to say, and to emphasise, that the bulletins published about the King's health are statements of fact and that nothing has been kept back.

Subsequently we were told of the anxiety which the King's condition had given rise to in these early weeks, and it appears that what the "Daily News" felt it a duty not only "to say," but also "to emphasise," was one of those "statements of fact" like the war-time "victories" which were more costly than defeats and were almost invariably followed by "withdrawals" "according to plan."

PATRIOTISM AND PROFIT.

The "Daily Mail," so solicitous for everything British and so anxious to preserve British industry and provide work and wages for British workers, remarks that—

increasing numbers of British investors and speculators are seeking investment opportunities abroad, and particularly across the Atlantic. ("Daily Mail," 27 November, 1928.)

Knowing the Britishness and integrity of the "Daily Mail," you will expect, as a matter of course, that the Editor will denounce this investment of British money in American industries and will particularly express his abhorrence of speculators. On the contrary he announces that—

each day we shall publish . . . a concise review . . . of the investment situation in New York, with helpful hints as to American and Canadian securities from the British investor's point of view.

THE NATIONAL INCOME.

Sir Josiah Stamp and Professor Bowley ("The National Income") have shown that

the total real national income in 1924 was approximately the same as in 1911, or, in other words, the value of the wealth produced (including incomes from abroad) had increased by the same percentage as prices. As population had in the meantime increased slightly, this meant that the total purchasing power per head of the population was slightly less than in 1911.

The national income is now definitely increasing again. Mr. G. D. Rokeling has recently conducted a further enquiry for the "Economist." It is published under the title, "A British Index of National Prosperity, 1920-1927," with a commendatory Introduction by Sir Josiah Stamp. (Published by the "Economist." 2s. 6d.)

In it Mr. Rokeling estimates (page 31) that the real national income has increased between 1920 and 1927 by about 8 per cent. The increase between 1924 and 1927 is 6.7 per cent. After allowing for the increase in population, this gives an increase per head of the population of 5.3 per cent. between 1924 and 1927. The "Economist" (October 6th, 1928) considers that this estimated increase is probably slightly less than the actual increase. H.

WALTHAMSTOW.**A LECTURE**

ON

"SOCIALISM AND TRADE UNIONISM"

BY

Comrade G. BELLINGHAM

AT

HOE STREET CO-OPERATIVE HALL,
SUNDAY, JANUARY 6th, 7.30 p.m.

ADMISSION FREE. QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION.

Lectures also on Feb. 3rd and Mar. 3rd.

LECTURES

AT

FRIARS HALL, BLACKFRIARS.
ROAD, S.E.

ON

SUNDAY EVENINGS AT 7-30 p.m.

- Jan. 6. "Socialism and the Living Wage."
COM. HARDY.
Jan. 13. "Socialism and the Case for Social Reform."
J. UTTIN.
Jan. 20. Speaker and Subject to be announced later.

THE WINGS OF THE I.L.P.

The possession of wings is a mixed blessing to an organisation, though it may be the means of keeping afloat those that possess little else. However, it is certainly a very popular complaint nowadays and afflicts alike Tory, Liberal, Labour, I.L.P. and Communist Parties. Its growth was slow at first, like all malignant diseases, but the example of Russia has given it a tremendous boost in post-war days.

At present the disease has reached an acute stage in the I.L.P., and the inevitable disintegrating process has set in. One by one the "intellectuals" who held sway in the past are leaving the ship, and intellectuals of the present are taking control of the ship.

The difference in essentials between the latter-day misleaders and their forerunners would require the liberal use of a microscope to discern.

The basic difference in policy may be summed up as follows: In the early days the policy was "Good old Keir Hardie"; in the middle period it was "Good old Ramsay MacDonald"; in the latest period it is "Good old Jimmy Maxton," the pirate who is stealing the laurels of the older warriors. The reason for these various policies is simple. The I.L.P., in the main, is concerned with men and not principles.

The official organ of the I.L.P. is a good illustration of this fact. Week after week it publishes pictures of "prominent" people in the "Labour Movement," and gushes over the doings of one or another. In its issue for November 23rd its front page contained photos of twenty of its contributors as an inducement to the workers to buy it. And this is supposed to be the inauguration of a new policy.

But, as mentioned above, the wing trouble is becoming acute. Maxton, like his predecessors, is finding it difficult to keep his feet in two camps at the same time. However, the fight for popularity between Maxton and the older gang is bringing forth some rather useful information of the uselessness, from the working-class point of view, of the reactionary policy of the I.L.P. Here are two informing items:—

I made a statement at the Conference that at the present time there is not a single constituency in the country where there is a majority of convinced Socialist electors. We have plenty of districts, such as Bermondsey, where there is an overwhelming Labour majority, but it is a

sheer delusion to think that the greater number of these people understand what we mean by Socialism. They neither understand it nor want it. (Dr. Alfred Salter, in a letter to the "New Leader," 12th October, 1928.)

Now it must be admitted that that is a very frank statement from a man who, on his own confession, has been elected to Parliament by the votes of non-Socialists. If the voters for Dr. Salter neither understand nor want Socialism, then obviously any action in the direction of accomplishing this end would be contrary to the wishes of his supporters and would jeopardise his seat. Dr. Salter, then, on his own admission, did not get elected through professing any Socialistic ideas.

He wrote another letter (or article) to the "New Leader," which appeared on December 7th. In this he said:—

Many of us who are long-standing members of the I.L.P. have been distressed during the past two or three years at what we regard as the disastrous leadership of the N.A.C. We know first-hand that the membership of the Party is decreasing seriously, that old stalwarts and supporters are resigning, that branches are disintegrating, and that finances are declining. We know that the Special Effort Fund this year is practically a failure owing to numbers of the usual subscribers refusing to contribute. We see the I.L.P., to which some of us have given the best years of our lives, going down to utter wreck and destruction.

A pleasant state of affairs this, after half a century of "gradualness" and the "little by little and bit by bit" policy! When we have urged the necessity of advocating Socialism, we have been told by I.L.P. protagonists that we were in too much of a hurry and that their policy of Socialism "in bits" was the way to build up a strong organisation. It looks like it!

GILMAC.

**EDMONTON
TOWN HALL****COME**

TO THE

SOCIALIST LECTURES

ON

SUNDAY, JANUARY 13th, 7.30 p.m.

" " " 27th, " "

" " " FEBRUARY 10th, " "

ADMISSION FREE. QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION.

OFFICIAL NOTICE.

All communications for the Executive Committee, Subscriptions for the SOCIALIST STANDARD, Articles, and Correspondence submitted for insertion therein, should be addressed—The Socialist Party of Great Britain, 17, Mount Pleasant, London, W.C.1, to whom Money Orders should be made payable. The meetings of the Executive Committee are held at the Head Office, every Tuesday, at 7.30 p.m.

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTIONS.

Twelve Months, post free... 2s. 6d.
Six Months, post free... 1s. 3d.

The Socialist Standard,

JAN.



1929

WEALTH AND DIRECTIVE ABILITY.

Socialists do not question the need for organisation in industry. What we do question is that Capitalist argument that industry is, and must be, directed by Capitalists. It is, in the main, already directed by salaried employees, members of the working class. Only in the field of financial operations do we find Capitalists themselves normally engaged, and even these operations are more and more being performed by paid employees. The Capitalist class own and control industry. They do not direct it. Recently certain Capitalist politicians and newspapers have disclosed some interesting facts and opinions on the "directive ability" of our masters.

First listen to Mr. Baldwin, speaking at Saint Andrew's Hall, Glasgow, on November 22nd, 1928 ("Morning Post," November 23rd):—

Since the days when private industry gave place to the joint stock company there have batted on the joint stock companies large numbers of men connected with management, and directors, who are parasitical to industry, and nothing but parasitical.

The City Editor of the "Manchester Guardian" (November 26th) commented on Mr. Baldwin's speech. He wrote:—

It is difficult in public life for a man to continue to hold a post after he has, through age or other cause, become obviously unfit to carry

out the duties attaching to it. But in the administration of public companies a far laxer standard prevails. It is almost a matter of tradition that once a man has been elected to a board he shall continue to hold his seat for life, and that, if for any reason his retirement is called for, he is entitled to compensation for loss of an office which, in most cases, is legally terminable by the shareholders without notice.

Then Sir Malcolm Robertson, Ambassador to Argentina, tells us that he knows of—

directors, chairmen, even general managers and passenger traffic managers, of some of the greatest companies connected with Argentina, who have never been in South America. ("Evening Standard," 11 December.)

Sir Henry Slesser, speaking at Denaby on December 17th, related an incident which recently happened in the House of Commons. He met a man and asked why he was looking so happy. The man replied:—

"Lord X has made me a director in one of his companies." Sir Henry Slesser asked if the man knew anything about the business of the company, and he replied "No, but it is worth £500 a year." ("Daily Express," 17 Dec.)

It seems, therefore, that directors do not have to know anything about the company, nor do they have to be where the work of the company goes on. If, then, directors do not direct, what do they do?

Mr. E. C. Grenfell, the banker and financier, answers that question. Speaking in the House of Commons, he said ("Hansard," December 10th, column 1813):—

The conception of a director, merely from his name, is that he directs the company; that he has a large share in appointing people; really, that he knows all about the company. Nothing is more fallacious. A director of most companies is a part-time man who serves the company to the best of his ability by giving advice when asked.

And these "parasites," these "part-time" gentlemen who "don't know anything about the company," but who give advice "to the best of their ability" about companies operating perhaps on the other side of the globe, sometimes get quite well paid. Something like £10,000 a year was paid to the directors of Marconi Company, a company which, according to the Editor of "The Times," was "scandalously mismanaged." ("Times," October 6th, 1927.)

Eight directors of the Dominion Tar and Chemical Company received £104,000 as "compensation for displacement" when the company was bought up by Canadian interests. ("Daily Express," December

6th.) When the Bodega Company was bought up by Slaters, the directors received £15,000 "compensation." ("Daily Express," November 30th.)

Two directors of Robert Ingham Clark and Co., paint manufacturers, received no less than £170,000 in similar circumstances. ("Daily Express," December 6th.)

And while we are on the subject of the special ability of our masters, let us turn from industry to the House of Lords, the special preserve of the leisured class. Lord Salisbury, speaking in the House of Lords on November 14th, 1928, said:—

We are called upon to take action because we are conscious that the legislation we are turning out of this House instead of being good is very often bad. It throws an enormous burden upon unfortunate litigants who are the victims of it.

He went on to describe recent legislation as "clumsy, slipshod, incomprehensible and inefficient." ("Daily Mail," November 15th.)

Lord Banbury said that "the greater part of the legislation passed in the last twenty years had better never have been passed."

What would we do without Capitalists to direct industry and hereditary rulers to legislate for us?

THE CHAMPIONS OF LABOUR!

After continually telling us recently that the Labour Party is a third Capitalist Party, we are somewhat amused to find the Communists in the new edition of "Communism is Commonsense" giving us the following:

Originally we claimed the right to belong to and work in the Labour Party merely because we were a part of the working-class movement, and the Labour Party, formed as it was mainly from the trade unions on a free federal basis, was intended by its founders as a common organisation for the whole workers' movement. But to-day we demand affiliation to the Labour Party, and our members in the trade unions try to get their union to support Communist affiliation, for a wider political reason, viz., that only the Communists can effectively lead the workers against the reactionary leadership of the Labour Party. The workers in the Labour Party need our Party to champion their cause against MacDonald and Co. (p. 23).

"Only Communists can lead the workers"!! considering the brilliant array of leaders of Communism pushed into jobs and afterwards denounced for being worse than the other leaders.

What the workers want is knowledge, not leaders. What the Communists in the Labour Party want is the leaders' jobs.

LESSONS FROM THE AMERICAN ELECTIONS.

The results of the elections for President make interesting reading. The Communists, masquerading as the Workers' Party, had a programme of immediate demands or reforms running into considerably over 100 and calculated to sweep the country. They polled 40,000 votes, or less than half the membership they claimed when they began in 1919 and before they adapted their name and programme to appeal to the masses.

The Socialist Labour Party polled 21,000 votes, against 30,000 four years ago. Their periodicals were full of "Electionitis," although the S.L.P. believes that "only the trade unions can set on foot the true political of labor," a claim which they have fathered on to Karl Marx, but can't find where and when he said such a thing.

With a party like the S.L.P. claiming that religion is a private matter, in a country chock full of belief in spooks they should have polled a heavy vote. The Socialist Party of America received about 250,000 votes, or about one-quarter of what they received when they ran Debs for President. With a long reform programme appealing to Labour as well as to "all classes," they can't stop their vote from falling.

To trim their sails a little more, the Socialist Party of America have recently decided to eliminate from the application for membership form, all references to "class struggle," "Capitalist Class," and "collective ownership," and replace this with a sentence affirming belief in independent political action.

These bodies with popular appeals and reform programmes are continually asserting that their method is one calculated to get the masses with them, but as these Election results show, the policy of dangling political carrots in front of the workers fails.

In America, Al Smith, the Democratic Candidate, was able to offer all kinds of captivating reform promises, and with a fair chance of election. So Al Smith got the reform votes.

If the Socialist Party of America had preached Socialism and got votes for Socialism, neither Republican nor Democrat could have enticed their votes away.

A. KOHN.

THE KINGS OF CAPITAL AND THE CAPTAINS OF INDUSTRY.

Once again America's rapid economic march illustrates the truth of the Socialist case. Twenty years ago we had occasion to point the lesson of the struggle between the Titans—Andrew Carnegie and Pierpoint Morgan. That was a conflict between two powers representing two factors in economic life. Not two individuals having a wrestling match, not a personal struggle between two great minds; but a dramatic and mighty clash between two social forces—one waning and outstripped by the economic advance, the other triumphant and in harmony with the economic trend. Carnegie's personal knowledge of the steel industry and his life-work in personal conduct of the steel business—this could not withstand the influence of mere moneyed men, Morgan and his banking colleagues of Wall Street; men who knew not the making of steel, but who controlled vast financial resources. And so Andrew Carnegie's Pittsburgh and other huge foundries became part of the United States Steel Corporation. Morgan won because those who controlled finance were able to buy and buy out those who knew the industry, but whose capital was smaller.

And that lesson illuminated industrial history since that day. The silent but sweeping changes in social life saw the passing of famous firms and famous names who had been absorbed by the huge financial combines. Men who boasted how much personal interest they took in the control of their business were pushed aside, crushed or swallowed up by the men who had a finger in hundreds or thousands of different businesses and who took no personal interest in manufacture. It was the day of the Big Banks, the Finance Company, the Debenture Loan or Stock, the Mortgage Bond and other strangleholds of finance that took charge of the title deeds of "the man of property and the men of industry."

Then upon the scene emerges the ideal of all anti-Socialist arguments—the Man of Invention appears—Henry Ford. Henry Ford was a pioneer in the industry with a small workshop actually engaged in the manufacture of motor engines. The suitability of the cheap motor to the times gave a rapid and continuous fillip to Ford's business. By using the inventions of many

others and gathering round him the picked and trained brains of the workers to superintend and run the industry, Fords became the largest motor business in the world.

Personal control and personal supervision played a good part in the early days of the business, but the time arrived in economic competition when mere personal control, brains and knowledge of an actual industry, no longer decided who was victor in the world of industry. The bankers of Wall Street, led by Morgan, heavily financed Ford's competitors, who were able to produce a cheap car which sold quicker than Fords. Henry Ford closed down for nearly a year in 1927, while the whole factory was overhauled and new machinery installed to get out an improved car that would once more capture the market. The 1928 Ford car came and was heralded as the wonder of autos, but the power of finance in the modern world was hardly reckoned with. The great competitor of Ford was no personally conducted firm with personal savings behind it, but the General Motors Corporation, backed by the leading financiers of America—a combine which had absorbed dozens of motor companies and other firms making all the parts and trimmings of the modern car. Ford's great asset—the use of the most modern machinery, each doing one small part and that only—this was duplicated and triplicated by the combine which had more finance than Ford. So the General Motors Co. at Detroit, Flint, and many other "plants," completely re-planned their machine industry and laid down the best and most efficient machines with the latest speeding-up methods.

Henry Ford—God of the Individualists, Apostle of Competition, Father of the Gospel of Personal Service—finds his firm to-day losing ground heavily. The great concern opposing him—owned by men who know not engines, but who have finance and can hire the trained workers who do know engines—this General Motors Co. are able to say that their Chevrolet Car—the one put out to smash the Ford—sold 84,503 in July, against 43,094 Fords.

Where will it end and what does it portend? The story of Morgan and Carnegie looks like being repeated. King Capital is no respecter of persons—Grow or bust, is his dictum!

And so the firm of Ford looks like eventually being driven to combine with the large

financial trust or go under. The workers will go on making cars and the bondholders will continue to reap the profits. Their employers will read stock exchange lists and thus get *their* knowledge of the industry. Henry Ford and his type will be shareholders in the concern which can do better by hiring hungry workers than by waiting for the working pioneer to get fresh ideas.

There is the lesson—ownership of wealth and more wealth is the winning card.

Finance buys up the personally-conducted businesses and becomes the ruler of more and more workers.

Shall the octopus grow or will the men and women who do the actual work in business and industry learn that they can run society without the parasite—financial or industrial?

A. KOHN.

"WHAT WOULD WE DO WITHOUT LEADERS?"

On October 22nd, 1928, Mr. Andrew Fisher died; peacefully, and "full of years and honour." Three months later occurred the death of "Jerry," an old ram well known in one of the great American stock-yards. Mr. Andrew Fisher, affectionately known as "Andy," and the old ram were both "leaders." Mr. Andrew Fisher was a "Labour" leader, "Labour" Prime Minister of Australia in 1914. He achieved fame by coining a phrase which was well known, if not exactly cheering, to the troops during the Great War. This was his pledge, on behalf of Australia and the Australian workers, to fight to "the last man and the last shilling." Some 200,000 Australian Trade Unionists enlisted, and many thousands were killed, wounded or missing in keeping Mr. Fisher's pledge. Mr. Fisher was not one of these. He preferred pursuits less strenuous and dangerous than war. We are told by a writer in the "Manchester Guardian" (October 23rd) that "the only relaxation he allowed himself was an occasional game of golf." The German humorist who said that the pledge meant England's determination to fight to the last Scotchman, evidently did not know that Mr. Andrew Fisher was a Scot.

"Jerry" was a leader of sheep. He used to lead them to the slaughter-house, just like "Andy," but he was one up on his Labour colleague. Whereas "Andy" at

most only sent 200,000 Trade Unionists into the Army, "Jerry" scored some 7 million among *his* kind of sheep. And while some of Andy's victims came back, more or less whole, none of Jerry's sheep ever escaped to tell the tale. On the other hand it has to be admitted that Jerry only succeeded in getting his sheep to commit suicide. Even Jerry might have failed to get them to murder each other, as did the world's workers in their masters' war.

Jerry and Andy were both highly esteemed by the Capitalist class. Jerry was valued and popular in the stock-yards, and Andy was offered (but refused) a knighthood.

Jerry and Andy both died peaceably in their beds.

Mr. Siegfried Sassoon, in a poem called "Base Details," has portrayed the type of non-combatant military "leader":—

If I were fierce, and bald and short of breath,
I'd live with scarlet Majors at the Base,
And speed glum heroes up the line to death,
You'd see me with my puffy petulant face,
Guzzling and gulping in the best hotel,
Reading the Roll of Honour. "Poor Young Chap,"

I'd say—"I used to know his father well;
Yes, we've lost heavily in this last scrap."
And when the war is done and youth stone dead,
I'd toddle safely home and die—in bed.

And any workers who "don't know what they would do without leaders" and are wondering how the Capitalist class will get their "cannon fodder" for the next great slaughter, will be relieved to learn that Australia soon found a suitable successor to Mr. Fisher. Less than two weeks after Andy's death, Mr. Theodore, director of the Australian Labour Party's campaign in the elections, referred to the action of his party in supporting the last war, and added:—"No one can impeach the Labour Party on its loyalty to Australia, Great Britain or the Crown. Whenever the test has been applied, Labour has never flinched from doing its duty." ("Manchester Guardian," November 18th, 1928.)

What would the Capitalist class do without "Labour" leaders? H.

GET TOGETHER!

Readers of the "Socialist Standard" who desire to be put into communication with other readers in their district are invited to notify the General Secretary, at 17 Mount Pleasant, W.C.1.

THE ECONOMIC LEAGUE DISCOVER SOME "SOCIALIST" FALLACIES.

Why should blue papers cause us trepidation? Why do we look upon them with suspicion? Seidlitz powders? Possibly. A pink wrapper would be an affront both to human intelligence and to medical science. Or is it that we associate blue papers with somewhat peremptory requests to show cause why, etc., or with polite invitations to appear at certain not greatly sought after institutions? Whatever the reason may be, I must say that the blue paper which was thrust into my hands recently, though possessing the conventional aspect of terror, did not justify the fears aroused by its presentment. But, like most productions of the "Economic League"—for it proved to be one of their efforts—it was not only harmless, but a really fine piece of imaginative literature, which fully excuses the existence of this obscure but very "well breached" body of "economists." (What they actually economise with will be shown later.)

The title of this leaflet intrigued me greatly—"Some Socialist Fallacies Exploded"—and I was astounded to find that the perpetrator was none other than (weh, guess—wrong first time!) the great C. E. Ross, whose name should be a household word, but who is unfortunately unknown to the writer. Of the Indian Finance Department, too—think of that! (Whether of the League of Nations or Woolworth's, we are left to wonder.) Retired, of course. After reading a little, I discovered that the title was most apt, except perhaps in one trifling particular—due to a printer's error, I assume. (With these delicate penny-aliner-linotype machines, the tidly-pin occasionally jams in the collychuff, thus disconnecting the caggle-waggle—and hence misprints occur.) In this case it is apparent that the word "Socialist" has got substituted for "Capitalist"—not that such a detail should inconvenience the Economic League, who can always plead their innocence to any charge of being fastidious with regard to such meticulous, hair-splitting distinctions.

The first item on the menu contains real mental pabulum:—

Fallacy No. 1.—All wealth is created by the

labour of the working-class alone. Therefore it should be owned and controlled by that class. This is the first of the fundamental principles laid down in the Manifesto of the Socialist Party of Great Britain. It is the real foundation of the whole Socialist creed, as all the other principles and objects of Socialism are more or less dependent upon it. It has often been called "the great Socialist Lie," but I prefer to call it a grossly misleading half-truth. It is perfectly true that labour is a most important factor in the creation of wealth, but it is not the only factor, and the principle, as laid down, is misleading for two reasons. In the first place, because it ignores the other two factors, viz., Natural Resources and Capital

I patiently waded through the "Manifesto" referred to, but I was most annoyed to find the printer had left this "first of the fundamental principles" out of my copy, and in fact the Socialist Party has never "laid down" any such principle. To a well-attuned ear (not a cabbage-leaf flap like my own) the word "Manifesto" is acoustically synonymous with "Declaration of Principles," and possibly would look the same to a member of the Economic League. On this assumption, therefore, the reader is invited to compare this Fallacy No. 1 with what is stated in the Declaration of Principles on the back page of this Journal. Comparisons are odious, of course, but I have no doubt the reader will note how punctillious the Economic League have been in rendering an exact replica of our principles. On the other hand, if he is of a perverse disposition, he may not! Except for the fact that the principles state that the working-class have not the spook-like quality of being able to "create" wealth, but merely "produce" wealth by expending their labour upon "natural resources" (implied by the use of the term "land"), the fact that no ethical deductions are drawn as to what the working-class *should* or *should not* own and control, and the further fact that the principles very definitely and emphatically state how the working-class can abolish classes altogether and bring into being a *classless* society, which will democratically own and control the "means of living" in the interest of the *whole community*—not in the interest of a class which has *ceased to exist*; except for these paltry differences, the Economic League has

"edited" our principles in the pleasing fashion usually associated with their propaganda, which invariably subordinates mere expediency to unequivocal expression of the truth. It may be excusable, however, on their part to refrain from adding difficulty to their case by taking the Socialist principles too literally.

That the Socialist dog may be beaten by any old stick—and quite jolly right, too!—is again ably demonstrated in the passage which follows on from the one last quoted:

And, secondly, because it defines labour as that of the working-class alone, by which is implied, and evidently intended to imply for the delusion of the uninitiated, the labour of the so-called wage slave only, to the exclusion of mental (i.e., inventive and administrative) labour. The omission of natural resources as a factor in the creation of wealth is significant. Without natural resources there could be no wealth, and it is to be noted that, in the creation of this essential factor, neither industrial capital nor labour had any part or lot whatsoever. Many people, besides Socialists, do not seem to realise the importance and significance of the fact that the word "Capital" is derived from *caput*, the head, and this, coupled with the physiological fact that all physical actions emanate from the brain, clearly demonstrates that, in the creation of wealth, the work of *caput*, the head, is of infinitely greater importance than that of *manus*, the hand.

I should hate to presume, but might not the term "Capital" be derived from "*capio*—I take"? If this should be the case, "capital" would apparently mean "I take all," but such an expression could only have significance in games of cards, so this derivation does not seem to fill the bill.

Obviously *caput*, the head, is of far more importance than *manus*, the hand, though both might be of equal utility in, say, knocking a nail in a wall—with a hammer, I mean! But these Capitalists have developed their heads to such a degree that they could knock screws into the sides of battleships with them, and in the event of a coal dispute they would be able to provide all the necessary fuel simply by meeting and putting their heads together, wooden they? (Steady!)

Whilst I might agree with the Economic League that the Capitalist is far too brainy to indulge in such a coarse expedient as WORK while he can buy working-class brains to perform the functions of inventors, managers, supervisors, agents, administrators, foremen, and indeed *every* function necessary to the effective running of the

Capitalist system, yet I think they are somewhat unkind to saddle the poor chap with the responsibility for the "direction" of industry. Take the coal industry, for example. The remarks of Lord Melchett (Alf. Mond to myself and other intimates) in his presidential address to the Institute of Fuel ("Daily Herald," November 22nd), if they refer to the Capitalist in the coal industry, do not accord them the justice they deserve.

The present methods of coal distribution in this country are in a shockingly primitive condition.

Coal was being dragged in small quantities, and in a quite unsystematic manner, about the towns. Two or three coal carts could often be seen in one street, each delivering a few hundredweights at a time.

Then they had the so-called "qualities" of coal, which scientifically they knew did not exist.

If all this could be standardised, simplified and unified, everybody would do much better. Whatever corner one touched there was an entire waste going on.

Turning to the productive side, Lord Melchett professed to see efforts made by the colliery owners towards peace in industry. He expressed his pleasure, and added: "If they had only done one-tenth of what they are doing now two years ago, we should never have had the strike."

The coal trade was faced with the problem of tiding over the present period of disorganisation and over-production in such a way that the world's output of coal when used with the greatest economy would satisfy its needs.

Nearly 300,000 miners were unemployed, and it was said that between 200,000 and 250,000 were a permanent unemployable surplus in the industry. It was a desperate load for an industry to assume, and the general desolation caused was almost too dreadful to think about.

Internal reorganisation should take place promptly. In what other industry would unproductive units be tolerated, such as were seen in the coal trade the world over?

One would almost think that that was said by a naughty Socialist, wouldn't one? It may be, however, that the Capitalist "directs" in every industry but the coal industry, and the Economic League may be right after all!

But how refreshing it is to find that the Economic League can agree with us that sunshine, rain, the ocean, land, etc. (or "natural resources" so called) were not "created" by the Capitalist, and that this "is significant." They do not state, however, whether the significance lies in the fact that the Capitalist draws most of the advantages from them, or in the fact that wealth is produced from them by the labour of the working-class alone—the Capitalist

is far too busy with other amusements to bother about this one. If the Economic League can afford the sum of 2d. from their coffers for the pamphlet "Socialism," they will find additional evidence of the subtle manner in which these Socialists "exclude" "mental" labour from their calculations. On page 2, for instance, it states:—

The essential thing is that the member of the working-class has to sell his labour-power in order to live. Beside this salient fact all else pales into insignificance. The differences of dress, pay, education, habits, work, and so on that are to be observed among those who have to sell their working power in order to live are as nothing compared with the differences which mark them off from the capitalists. No matter how well paid the former is, or how many have to obey his commands, he himself has a master. He has to render obedience to another, to some-

one who can send him adrift to endure the torments of unemployment. Because he has to sell his labour-power, his whole life must be lived within prescribed limits. His release from labour is short and seldom; he has no security of livelihood; he has always to fear that a rival may displace him.

No! We have not noticed that the "abilities" of the Capitalist are used to "blackleg" on the working-class, who appear to have the monopoly of WORK, mental or physical—he does not keep dogs and bark himself.

Well, reader, the first "Socialist" fallacy having gone off with an appropriate bang, the consideration of the others can be left over for our next issue.

SARCASTIGATOR.

MARXISM TO-DAY.

The above is the title of a series of articles in the widely read magazine, "Current History," for October, 1928.

These articles comprise a discussion by three writers—Prof. Laski, Morris Hillquit, and Prof. Carver, who holds the Chair of Economics at Harvard University. With the threadbare apologies of arguments used by Prof. Carver against Marx we are not now concerned. Neither shall we deal with the theory of Hillquit that Marxism is "essentially evolutionary," especially as "Father" Hillquit, of the Socialist Party of America, forgets to supply any evidence to support the title of his article.

The position held by Prof. Laski and the following he has among many workers may make it worth while to call attention to some of the Professor's statements. The title of his contribution is "The Value and Defects of the Marxist Philosophy." While he says something about the value of Marxian philosophy, he never once attempts to show the defects of the Marxian view. In other words, he used the name of Marx to support a number of policies, but never attempts to show that Marx accepted them.

He says Marx developed the strategy of Communism, and this was it:—

"The Industrial Revolution brought with it the massing of the workers in the factories; trade unions developed in consequence to protect the interests of the workers. As these come to realise that their divorce from the means of production

keeps them in subjection to the Capitalist régime, they become increasingly hostile to it.

"They develop accordingly a growing class consciousness. Their solidarity finds expression in a revolutionary party which becomes dissatisfied with small concessions and insists upon the seizure of the State.

"There then develops the final struggle with the Capitalists, who to retain power will stop at no means, however violent or brutal. The workers accordingly are driven to retort in kind. They seize in open warfare the institutions of the State and establish a dictatorship of the proletariat, which by its iron rigor controls the transition from a Capitalist to a Communist Society. The period admittedly is one of bloody conflict, since no class—witness the Civil Wars in England and the French and Russian Revolutions—will peacefully submit to its own suppression. Since, therefore, the master class cannot be persuaded to surrender by democratic means, the class-conscious workers are the spearhead of the proletariat who drive the latter to victory."

Where does Prof. Laski get this from? What he has done, no doubt, in order to find some arguments against Marx, is to neglect Marx' and Engels' writings and simply borrow from the manifestoes and theses of the Bolsheviks and father the lot on to Marx.

Marx and Engels, after laying bare the evolution of class society, insisted, as long

ago as 1848 in the "Communist Manifesto," that the emancipation of the working class could only be achieved by the immense majority in the interest of the immense majority. In the same manifesto the workers are told that their first step must be to win the battle of democracy.

Right through their writings they insist upon the need for political action to accomplish the Social Revolution. The belief in violence as the road to Revolution was denounced by Marx and Engels in their attacks on Bakunin and his general strike and insurrection mania. The Bolshevik dream of a minority winning power for the rest of the workers was scathingly answered by Engels in his article (printed in THE SOCIALIST STANDARD) on "The Programme of the Blanquist Fugitives from the Commune."

Even if Prof. Laski attempted to use the fragmentary writings of Marx and Engels on the class struggles in France between 1848 and 1850, he would have to face the fact that both Marx and Engels recognised that conditions were the determining factor in laying down a policy. So that when these battles were over they recognised the need of a different policy. And their activity in favour of universal suffrage and the organisation of the workers is plain evidence of their realism. Read! Mr. Laski, Engels' striking preface of 1895 to Marx's "Class Struggles in France," and see there how he recognised that no minority action, no violent attack, no clever seizure of State, could ignore the need for Socialist education and organisation of the working class for political control of the State.

In no publication did Marx urge that the dictatorship of the proletariat was a necessary step under modern conditions for the world's workers.

In semi-feudal countries with a large peasantry, where the wage workers were a minority two or three generations ago, the phrase dictatorship was used in outlining policy. But in most cases Marx preferred the phrase used in the Communist Manifesto and also in the Programme of the Communist League of 1848—"the Rule of the Proletariat." And the dictatorship referred to was not, like in Russia, a dictatorship of a few, but, as Engels indicates in the preface to the "Commune of Paris"—a "dictatorship" which relied upon universal suffrage. Mr. Laski should

know that in modern countries with a majority composed of wage workers, the phrase "dictatorship of proletariat" has lost its meaning. It is out of date. For if the workers are the majority, how can there be a dictatorship of the majority!

But Professors are always trying to put Marx right, and so next month we will see how Prof. Carver does it.

A. K.

BOUND VOLUMES.

Bound volumes of the SOCIALIST STANDARD can now be supplied as follows:—

1-year Volume	September 1910, to August, 1911	6/6
2-year Volume	September, 1910, to August, 1912	8/6
3-year Volume	September, 1910, to August, 1913	10/6
4-year Volume	September, 1910, to August, 1914	12/6
1-year Volume.	September, 1914, to August, 1915	6/6
2-year Volume.	September, 1914, to August, 1916	8/6
3-year Volume	September, 1914, to August, 1917	10/6
4-year Volume	September, 1914, to August, 1918	12/6
1-year Volume.	Since September, 1918	4/3
2-year Volume	Since September, 1918	6/6
3-year Volume.	Since September, 1918	9/-

Postage extra

S.P.G.B. PROPAGANDA MEETINGS

LONDON DISTRICT.

Sundays	Clapham Common, 3 p.m. Tottenham, West Green Corner, 11.30 a.m. Tooting, Garrett Lane, Tooting Broadway, 7.30 p.m. Victoria Park, 4 p.m. Woolwich, Beresford Square, 7.30 p.m. Hyde Park, 11.30 p.m. Paddington, Prince of Wales, 8 p.m.
Mondays	Paddington, Prince of Wales, 8 p.m. Clerkenwell, Garnault Place, 8 p.m.
Wednesdays	Hackney, Paragon Road and Mare Street, 8 p.m. Paddington, Prince of Wales, 8 p.m.
Thursdays	Becontree, Rodney Street, Ilford, 8 p.m.
Fridays	Clerkenwell, Acton, St., Grays Inn Rd, 8 p.m. West Ham, Water Lane, 8 p.m.
Saturdays	Wood Green, Jolly Butchers Hill, 8 p.m. Leyton, Corner Grange Park, 7.30 p.m.

HANLEY BRANCH.

Sundays	Hanley Market Square, 7 p.m. Burslem, St. John Square, 7 p.m.
----------------	--

BRANCH DIRECTORY.

- BATTERSEA.**—Sec., 2, Hanbury-road, S.W.11. Branch meets Thursday, 8.30 p.m. at The Waiting Room, Latchmere Baths, entrance in Burns-road. Discussion second Thurs. in month.
- BECONTREE.**—Sec., Hy. Gratton, 4, Drummond Ave., Brooklands, Romford. Branch meets 1st and 3rd Wednesdays at 7.30, at above address.
- BIRMINGHAM.**—Sec. E. Jesper, 88, Rollason-rd., Erdington. Branch meets The Continental Café, Moor St., 1st and 3rd Sundays at 11 a.m.
- CAMBERWELL.**—Branch meets at Camberwell Trades Council Room, 6A, Artichoke Place, Camberwell Green, every Friday at 8.30 p.m. Discussions—public invited. Letters to Secretary at above address.
- CENTRAL.**—Membership obtained only through the Ex. Committee. Applications to General Sec.
- CLERKENWELL.**—Branch meets Wednesdays, 8 p.m., at 17, Mount Pleasant, W.C.1. Discussions first Wednesday in month at 8 p.m.—all invited. Sec., at above address.
- EAST LONDON.**—Sec., D. Jacobs, 28, Lyal Road, Bow, E.8.
- GLASGOW.**—Sec. W. Falconer, 128, Bluevale Street. Branch meets every Thursday, 7.30 p.m., Unitarian Church Hall, Ross Street, Glasgow. Public invited. Discussions.
- HACKNEY.**—Branch meets The Old Gravel Pit Hall, Mare-street, Hackney, Mondays, 8 p.m., Discussions 9.30. Communication to Sec. as above.
- HANLEY.**—Branch meets Tuesdays, Working Men's Club, Glass-st. Sec., F. Goldstraw, 38, Paddock Street, Hanley.
- ISLINGTON.**—Branch meets Wednesdays, 8.30, at 144, Seven Sister-rd., Holloway, N. Sec., M. Baker, 18, Orpingley-rd., N.7.
- LEYTON.**—Sec., A. Holland, 396, Lea Bridge-rd., Leyton. Branch meets 8 p.m., Trades and Labour Hall, Grove House, High-rd., every Monday. Public invited.
- MANCHESTER.**—Sec., W. Addison, 111, West Park-street, Salford, Manchester.—Branch meets 1st and 3rd Thursdays in month, 7.45 p.m., at 114, Duke St., Stretford-road.
- PADDINGTON.**—Branch meeting held on 2nd and 4th Fridays, 8 p.m., in room above the Co-operative Stores, 306, Kilburn-lane, W.9 (side door).
- SOUTHEND-ON-SEA.**—Sec., J. Bird, 5 Wellington-avenue, Westcliffe-on-Sea.
- TOOTING.**—Sec., 15, University-road, Collier's Wood, S.W. 19. Branch meets every Friday at 8 p.m. at Tooting Adult School, 971, Garratt-lane, S.W. 17.
- TOTTENHAM.**—Secretary, 18, Woodlands Park Rd., N.15. Branch meets Fridays, Room 2, Trades Hall, 7, Bruce Grove. Discussion after branch business. Public invited.
- WALTHAMSTOW.**—Sec., S. E. Williams, 3, Dyson-rd., Leytonstone, E.11. Branch meets at Workmen's Hall, High-st., every Monday.
- WATFORD.**—A. Lawson, Sec., 107 Kensington-avenue, Watford. Branch meets Mondays at 8.30 p.m. at Secretary's address.

- WEST HAM.**—Branch meets Thursdays at 8 p.m. at 167 Romford-rd., Stratford. Sec., P. Hallard, 22, Colegrave-rd., Stratford, E.
- WOOD GREEN.**—All communications to Sec., F. W. Godfrey, 71, Falkland Road, N.8.
- WOOLWICH.**—Branch meets at 94, Griffin Road, Plumstead. Communications to Secretary at above address.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN.

OBJECT.—The establishment of a system of society based upon the common ownership and democratic control of the means and instruments for producing and distributing wealth by and in the interests of the whole community.

DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain HOLDS—

That society as at present constituted is based upon the ownership of the means of living (i.e., land, factories, railways, etc.) by the capitalist or master class, and the consequent enslavement of the working class by whose labour alone wealth is produced.

That in society, therefore, there is an antagonism of interests, manifesting itself as a class struggle, between those who possess but do not produce and those who produce but do not possess.

That this antagonism can be abolished only by the emancipation of the working class from the domination of the master class, by the conversion into the common property of society of the means of production and distribution, and their democratic control by the whole people.

That as in the order of social evolution the working class is the last class to achieve its freedom, the emancipation of the working class will involve the emancipation of all mankind, without distinction of race or sex.

That this emancipation must be the work of the working class itself.

That as the machinery of government, including the armed forces of the nation, exists only to conserve the monopoly by the capitalist class of the wealth taken from the workers, the working class must organise consciously and politically for the conquest of the powers of government, national and local, in order that this machinery, including these forces, may be converted from an instrument of oppression into the agent of emancipation and the overthrow of privilege, aristocratic and plutocratic.

That as political parties are but the expression of class interests, and as the interest of the working class is diametrically opposed to the interests of all sections of the master class, the party seeking working-class emancipation must be hostile to every other party.

The SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain, therefore, enters the field of political action determined to wage war against all other political parties, whether alleged labour or avowedly capitalist, and calls upon the members of the working class of this country to muster under its banner to the end that a speedy termination may be wrought to the system which deprives them of the fruits of their labour, and that poverty may give place to comfort, privilege to equality, and slavery to freedom.

Those agreeing with the above principles and desiring enrolment in the Party should apply for membership form to secretary of nearest branch or at Head Office.

THE Socialist Standard

The Official Organ of **THE SOCIALIST PARTY** of Great Britain.

No. 294. Vol. 25.]

LONDON, FEBRUARY, 1929.

[MONTHLY, TWOPENCE.]

THE WORKERS UNDER "LABOUR RULE." LESSONS FROM AUSTRALIA.

The *Socialist Review*, organ of the I.L.P., has been publishing articles on the Australian Labour Movement by one of its supporters, Mr. L. Ross.

Mr. Ross gives evidence which supports our repeated assertion that the administration of capitalism by the Labour Party, whether in Great Britain or Australia, or anywhere else, is of no material advantage to the working-class, and is not a change which brings Socialism nearer.

Mr. Ross points out (*Socialist Review*, December, 1928) that the taking over of various industries by the Labour Governments helps to reduce prices, but since the general level of wages under capitalism is influenced directly by the cost of living of the workers, the effect of lowered prices under Labour Governments is just the same as elsewhere—wages fall correspondingly and the capitalist class are the gainers; "as prices fall, all wages, settled by the arbitration courts . . . fall automatically."

LABOUR GOVERNMENT AND BIG PROFITS.

Mr. Ross goes on to show that the effect of "Labour" administration and the extension of nationalisation is to increase production and the employers' profits.

"Premier Lang (Labour) presided at the opening of new factories and expressed gratification because he found that most of the manufacturing and other industries were paying dividends of 10 per cent. or over."

Again he says that the chief electioneering propaganda of the New South Wales Labour Party at the last election was "a long list of the dividends the capitalist firms were paying in order to show that Labour

brought prosperity and no one suffered."

"Labour legislation," says Mr. Ross, "has brought higher profits, a more unequal division of the wealth of the country." He quotes from a work by Labour Minister Lacombe, of Queensland (*Labour's Ten Years' Progress*) that after their experience of Labour rule, investors "have absolute confidence in the Labour Government."

When trade is bad, Labour Governments treat their employees in the nationalised industries in just the same way as the private capitalists treat theirs. "Men are retrenched or given the alternative of shorter hours and decreased pay . . . the State employees are the first to suffer."

These State industries are, of course, set up by means of Government loans. The capitalist invests his money in Government loans instead of in private companies. He thus gives up the chance of fluctuating dividends which may be high or may disappear, and gets a fixed rate of interest with absolute security. Under Labour Governments, like other Governments, it is the workers whose wages are cut when trade declines: "The money-lenders, of course, suffer no reduction whatever in their interest receipts."

At this point, Mr. Ross plaintively asks: "What is the good of a Labour Government if it can find no way out except the way of capitalism?"

THE LIVING WAGE AND FAMILY ALLOWANCES.

Mr. Ross goes on to describe the effect of the introduction of Family Allowances in New South Wales. This is of particular interest, because it is from New South

Wales that the I.L.P. borrow the scheme of Family Allowances which is an integral part of its Living Wage programme. The I.L.P. proposes that the State should give an allowance of 5s. a week to working-class mothers in respect of each child. The I.L.P. are, of course, aware that this scheme has been used on the Continent as a means of reducing the wages of single men, so that, in effect, the married men's children are supported at the expense of childless workers, which costs the employers nothing.

It is instructive therefore to learn from Mr. Ross that this is precisely what has happened as a result of the introduction of Family Allowances by the New South Wales Labour Government.

The New South Wales scheme, instead of redistributing wealth, actually meant a reshuffling of wages between single and married men. Much of the Labour legislation has had this characteristic that it has so little harmed the capitalists that the non-Labour Governments have taken it over and left the Labour parties without a distinctive policy."

LABOUR GOVERNMENTS AND STRIKERS.

Mr. Ross tells us also about the suppression of strikes by Labour Governments in Australia.

In 1926, Queensland railway workers decided to help striking sugar mill employees by refusing to handle goods produced by "blacklegs." The Labour Premier, McCormack, promptly dismissed the strikers. The Labour newspaper, *The Daily Standard*, criticised his action, and the Labour Government then struck a severe blow at the paper's finances by withdrawing all Government advertisements from it.

In South Australia, the Labour Government employs "vigilance men" to act as "private detectives" in the State industries to see that the workers do their work properly. In general, says Mr. Ross, the treatment of their employees by Labour Governments has been "less progressive than enlightened American capitalism." He sums up by saying that "I think that Queensland is further away from Socialism as a result of Labour Rule."

After demonstrating once more that capitalism works in just the same way, as far as the workers are concerned, whether administered by Conservatives or Labourites or anyone else, Mr. Ross produces his

"remedy." It is a demand for "sincerity" and "unselfishness"! He fails completely to realise that the factor which dominates the Australian situation is the factor which dominates the situation in Europe, America and elsewhere.

That is the lack of Socialists. The great mass of Australian workers, like the workers generally, do not understand Socialism and do not want it. Until there are sufficient Socialists, organised in a Socialist Party, there will not be Socialism. "sincerity" and "unselfishness" notwithstanding.

The way to increase the number of Socialists is to support the Socialist Party, financially or by joining actively in its work.

H.

OUR FIRST PROSPECTIVE CANDIDATE FOR PARLIAMENT

At a meeting of the Battersea Branch, Comrade Barker, of the Tooting Branch, was adopted as prospective candidate of the Socialist Party of Great Britain for Battersea.

It now remains for those who desire to see our candidate go to the polls to give practical effect to their wishes by swelling the Parliamentary Fund to the required dimensions.

As we pointed out originally, our candidates will go to the polls if we are provided with sufficient funds to carry the business through.

PAMPHLETS FOR SALE.

We have had a big demand for the pamphlets published by the Socialist Party of Canada, and the following can still be supplied —

"Wage-Labour and Capital" (Marx), 60 pages, 4d.

"Communist Manifesto" (Marx and Engels), 59 pages, 4d.

"Causes of Belief in God" (Lafargue), 48 pages, 6d.

"Socialism—Utopian and Scientific" (Engels), 95 pages, 6d.

"Value, Price and Profit" (Marx), 78 pages, 6d.

Note.—Postage extra; ½d. per copy.

"THE MODERN CASE FOR SOCIALISM."

By A. W. Humphreys. Price 12/6. George Allen and Unwin, Ltd.

This book is a welter of confused and contradictory ideas, relieved here and there by some useful information and argument.

It contains 268 pages divided into nine chapters. The author does not claim to cover the whole case for Socialism. He is wise. But he would have been wiser had he found out what the whole case for Socialism was before he started the book. The title of the book is certainly misleading. It is in no sense the "modern case for Socialism"—in fact, it is not the case for Socialism at all, as more than half of it is taken up with the case for Nationalisation and the so-called "Guild Socialism."

The contradictions, omissions and errors, from the point of view of Socialism, are too many to cover in a review, so I can do no more than call attention to a few.

Before doing so, however, I must give him credit for having written some excellent sections on the concentration of capital, the position of inventors, and the nature and ramifications of the trusts, and also some useful information on the wages and conditions of labour, and profit-making at home and abroad.

At the front of the book there is a list of authorities quoted, but it is significant that in this list no mention is made of the most important book ever written connected with the subject, and that book is "Capital," by Karl Marx. In fact, a glance over this list of authorities drives one to the conclusion that the author has obtained most of his information at secondhand and from pamphlets.

The first chapter on "The Source of Wealth" is fairly clear and fairly simple, but even here the author stumbles. On page 23 we read: "All wealth is the product of labour," and on page 26: "The moral law is rooted in the economic truth that labour is the source of all wealth." The latter may be a very pretty sentence, but it is both untrue and empty. Human energy and natural resources are the source of wealth. The "moral law" is merely an empty phrase.

On page 24 we read:—

Labour being, as we have seen, the only creative agency in that process, it follows that Labour is the source of all value.

Farther down on the same page we come across the following:—

Meanwhile two of the commonest objections to this labour theory of value must be disposed of. One is that land has value but is not the product of labour. Land, however, has value under only two conditions: either it is cultivated, and therefore the value arises from the labour of the cultivator, or it acquires value by reason of the fact that labour carried on in its vicinity creates a demand for it."

There is, surely, a manifest contradiction between these two quotations. If "labour is the source of all value," how can land upon which no labour has been spent have any value? It cannot, and has not. The author confuses value and price in the second quotation. Land upon which no labour has been spent may have a price, but it has no value.

A few pages later on the author confuses profit with surplus value, as if the two were identical. Under the heading "How Profit Arises," on page 28, we find:—

Thus supposing the working day to be of eight hours, the worker may produce the value which he receives back in wages, in say, three hours, and the results of his work during the remaining five hours are annexed by the capitalist. The value created in this five hours is the surplus value, or profit, which the worker is compelled to leave in the possession of the capitalist.

The remaining five hours mentioned is surplus value, but all of this is not profit. Out of this five hours the Capitalist pays rent, interest and allots an amount for future production as well as taking his profit. The profit a given Capitalist concern makes (leaving aside for the moment any hidden or artificial reserves) is the amount they have over during a particular period of trading, after making allowances for necessary sinking fund, duties payable, ground or other rents, royalties, honorariums and other tributes to other Capitalists, besides advertising, etc., expenses, all of which come out of the surplus value produced by the workers in the particular concern.

Now, according to the quotation given above from page 28, the difference between what the worker gets and the value he produces is surplus value. On page 46 the author gets himself into a tangle again, with the following astonishing statement:—

The trade unions and the Labour Party are the means by which the workers defend their portion of the surplus value produced by their labour and strive to increase it.

We would assume that there is a printer's error here, but taken in conjunction with other matter in the book, we are

forced to the conclusion that it is only an expression of the author's lack of grasp of economics, of which there is plenty of evidence throughout.

However, perhaps the few points mentioned from the opening sections are a sufficient illustration of the character of the author's analysis, and we will only take one or two points that occur later on in the book.

From page 142 we take the following:—

The banks do create credit; by creating credit they increase the supply of money, and thus influence prices and the volume of production . . .

Money exchanges for goods. If the volume of money increases without a corresponding increase in the quantity of goods, then money, considered in relation to goods, will have declined in value. Because money has declined in value a given quantity of money will not exchange for the same amount of goods as formerly. To purchase that amount of goods more money will be needed, which is another way of saying that prices will rise. This is what in fact does occur. An increase in money without a corresponding increase in goods brings about a rise in prices. An increase in the quantity of money is called an inflation of the currency. Thus, we reach the position that inflation causes a rise in prices.

He then reverses the process to show a reversed result.

It is all very neat and pretty. However, neat arguments are not necessarily sound arguments.

In the first place, a mere increase in the quantity of money is not an inflation of the currency. An inflation of the currency can only occur under certain special conditions, which include weakness in the backing behind the currency. Now if there is one thing that practically everybody accepts to-day it is that crises, and in recent times the crises in the cotton, steel, shipbuilding and other industries, are brought about by the expansion of production beyond the effective demand, bringing in its train a fall in prices. Increased credit facilities have been blamed, in the main, for enabling manufacturers to flood the market. In consequence there is an all-round whine that prices are ruling too low, and Capitalists are looking to "rationalisation" as a royal road out of this difficulty.

The main trouble, however, is that Mr. Humphreys is confusing credit facilities with currency. Money has many functions, and one of these functions is to act as currency. Before he started upon this neat little argument he should have shown how the volume of money that acts as currency is increased.

His confusion on this point leads him to the statement that:—

The increased development of the use of credit in carrying on industrial operations has made the banks the controllers of the volume of money, and, therefore, in some degree of prices, which in turn affects the balance of trade. (p. 150.)

And also:—

The banks keep their balances at the Bank of England, and in the last resort their lending powers rest on the Bank of England's gold, but this gold basis has for years been declining in importance, and to-day is of little significance. (p. 145.)

On the same day that this review was being written the writer read the annual report of the Chairman (Mr. F. G. Goodenough) of Barclays Bank. From this report the following extracts are taken bearing upon the above remarks:—

Another important factor affecting industry and trade has been the stabilisation of currencies in terms of gold by certain countries, and especially France, during the year. It may now be said that for all practical purposes the stabilisation of world currencies on a gold basis has been virtually completed, and this should prove a factor in the stabilisation of price levels as between one country and another.

It is provided by the Currency and Bank Notes Act, 1928, that the Bank of England and the Treasury acting in agreement, may reduce the fiduciary limit as and when they may think fit, while provision is also made for an expansion in the fiduciary limit should the circumstances warrant. The power to reduce the fiduciary circulation would probably be utilised if, after a period, it was found that the currency available was permanently in excess of the country's needs, as, for example, might prove to be the case in the event of an appreciable and permanent fall in price levels. (The Sunday Times, 20/1/29.)

("The fiduciary limit" means the quantity of bank notes that may be issued without a gold backing.)

In other words, the gold basis is very much in existence, and trade only absorbs the amount of currency required to facilitate business transactions, the rest lies in the Bank. This disposes of Mr. Humphrey's illusion that currency is a fixed quantity which is split (gawd knows how!) in certain proportions over the goods being sold at a given moment. As a matter of fact, he is only bringing to life again the hoary old quantity theory of money which has been destroyed time after time.

The aim of his argument is shown in the climax. He is out for the nationalisation of the Banks. In fact, the last hundred pages of his book is mainly occupied with a glorification of nationalisation. As the

subject has been often dealt with adequately in these columns during the last few months we will not pursue Mr. Humphreys on the subject, where he frequently mixes public ownership with Socialism and has a good deal to say about that mysterious entity, "the public"!

In the opinion of the author, Socialist theory will be put into practice by the Guilds. And this is how they will do it:—

The Guilds in being, there would fall to them the duty and privilege of running their respective industries. The Guild would decide the methods; it would be the owner of what was produced; it would divide the proceeds of the sale of its products among its members, according to principles and rates of pay which the members themselves would lay down. Out of its income the Guild would make provision for the maintenance of its members in sickness, unemployment, and old age. (pp. 256-257.)

The factory, mine, shipyard, or other centres of production would be the natural and fundamental unit of industrial democracy. This involves not only that the factory must be free, as far as possible, to manage its own affairs, but also that the democratic unit of the factory must be made the basis of the larger democracy of the Guild. The duties of the larger organisations of the Guild would consist chiefly of co-ordination of the production of the various units, making general regulations, supplying raw material, selling such products as were not disposed of locally, and representing the Guild in its relations with other Guilds and the community as a whole. (p. 258.)

As to the all-important question of prices, the instrument of taxation would be a means of checking any tendency on the part of a Guild to overcharge, supposing that in any instance or at any time the decisions jointly made with the State were not loyally observed. For taxation would be levied not on individuals but on Guilds, and as justice in taxation implies that those with most shall pay most, a Guild getting unqually wealthy by keeping up prices would find that its excessive surplus was skimmed off by the State for communal purposes.

The main point to be grasped at this point, however, is that, though the community would have the right to intervene in matters affecting the general welfare, the internal affairs of the Guild would be a matter for the Guild alone. (p. 261.)

At this point it may be as well to make clear that it is not imagined that under the Guild system we should find the whole population to the last man in Guild membership. There is, for example, the case of artists and fine types of craftsmen. No one suggests that any such workers should be forced into a Guild against their will. They would, in all likelihood, be able to make an ample living working independently, for with the higher standard of living and of education which would be the rule in Socialist society, there would be a much greater demand for all beautiful things than there is to-day. (p. 262.)

Now, gentle and unsophisticated reader, you should have an adequate idea of Mr. Humphrey's conception of Socialism, and therefore the value of his book as a contribution to the "Modern Case." As you see above, there will be privileged classes, taxation, buying and selling, high and low prices, and other bric-a-brac of Capitalism as we know it to-day.

GILMAC.

"CEMENT."

A BOLSHEVIK NOVEL.

"Cement," by Feodor V. Gladkov. Martin-Lawrence. 7s. 6d. and 3s. 6d.

This is the much-heralded novel of Bolshevik Russia, translated into English by A. S. Arthur and C. Ashleigh. It has run through many editions in France and Germany and is widely read in Russia itself.

The author takes as his background Russia in 1920-21, and his chief character is a Red Army soldier returned from the Front to find the local cement factory ruined and the workers idling their time away and the children almost starving.

His wife has no longer any time for him, being occupied in Party and Soviet work, besides having turned to other men in his absence. A good deal of the work is occupied with the efforts of the returned Red soldiers to get the Communist bureaucrats to get the factory restarted. This part of the book brings out the shortcomings of a Communist Dictatorship of Intellectuals who dominate with merciless discipline the mass of the workers and their wives, etc.

The more or less vague practice of "free love" running through the story seems unreal and far-fetched under the circumstances of the time, and the fetish of the Red women that they are free to choose new mates at random is poorly worked out by the author.

The sex life of the hero and his wife is continually brought to our attention, but the book finishes without any definite attitude between them.

For a glimpse of Russia at the opening of the era of the New Economic Policy, the book is interesting, but a real novel of life in Russia under Bolshevism is not yet written, or perhaps we should say translated, into English.

A. KOHN.

IMAGINATION.

The year 1929 is the most tremendously important year the world has ever seen. Perhaps that is an over-statement. It *could* be the most profoundly momentous year the human race has experienced. This year that portion of humanity which inhabits the British Isles will be asked to decide whether it wishes the reign of King Capital to continue or that it should come to an end. The preliminary call has gone forth, and those who say it should end and a saner system established have banded themselves together in an organisation called the Socialist Party. We cannot, honestly speaking, say that the response has been overwhelming. Had it been of sufficient magnitude, the year 1929 could have been the most epoch-making year in the history of mankind. It has been said that the discovery of fire was the greatest event in human affairs. The invention of printing has also been described as a tremendous human achievement. A similar claim has more recently been made on behalf of wireless telephony. Now, without indulging in the fascinating discussion of these highly interesting topics, we can agree that they had one feature in common, a feature which marks them off from the great discovery of Socialism. Each of them was demonstrable by their discoverers to a less favoured or less imaginative audience. For, one must confess, the quality of imagination is comparatively rare. Even nowadays, when we are surrounded by the fruits of human imagination and inventiveness, the response to an imaginative appeal, unless purely emotional, is usually disappointing. Even in a comparatively small event, like the Daylight Saving, one has to admit that vast numbers of one's fellows had to be kicked into acquiescence. Those who have read Elia's "Dissertation on Roast Pig" will remember that the discoverer of that delicacy was viewed with great disfavour—until people had tasted the new dish. One can imagine the original discoverer of the uses of fire having a most unpleasant time, denounced as a trafficker with unclean spirits, as a dealer with mysteries, as a wizard, and what not, until his more stolid contemporaries were convinced by personal trial that there was "something in it." Coming nearer our own time, one remembers the scorn which greeted the first bicycles, the first motors, the first aero-

planes, the first wireless. It was not until repetition and perseverance had made these things familiar that mankind in general accepted them. But here, as in everything so far, demonstration was possible for the conversion of the unimaginative many.

The profound difficulty with Socialism is that it cannot be demonstrated. It is a complete system of human society to which a new principle is to be applied. Many enthusiasts with an insufficient knowledge of their subject have endeavoured to found little communities, run as they thought on Socialist lines. All have failed, for Socialism can only be applied to a highly organised community, and on a large inclusive scale. It is not a principle applied to simple forms, such as Monarchism or Republicanism. It is a complete change in the basis of society. It is therefore impossible to show samples, as it were, of a complete and fundamental change. Socialism and Capitalism are mutually exclusive, although, curiously enough, each deals with the same things. Railways would still run, factories still work, power stations still function, the soil still be tilled, under Socialism as under Capitalism. The great difference would be ownership, and therefore control. Instead of being operated by the whole people, for the private benefit of private owners, they would still be operated by the whole people, but for the public benefit of the communal people. Private owners only employ just so many as they can profitably make use of. Private owners only allow their plant to produce wealth when a profit is to be made. In short, private owners of the means of wealth-making only allow their machine to run for private ends. But with social ownership the outlook is entirely changed. There would be no idlers of any sort, rich or poor, for it would be to the interest of everyone that there should be abundance of everything. There would be no slack times and semi-starvation because too much wealth had been produced, as at present. If, under Socialism, too much wealth were produced, it would be, first, the signal for a real holiday, and, second, for an enquiry into why the Statistical Department had not properly adjusted supply to public needs. There would be no rubbishy boots, shoddy clothing, jerry-built houses and adulterated food. The market for trash would go the way of all markets. It would follow poverty

and ignorance into the limbo of forgotten Capitalism.

But if the workers are waiting to be shown a working model of the proposed new system they are waiting for the impossible. A picture of society under Socialism can only be constructed by the imagination aided by an analysis of our present condition and a knowledge of human history. Clever men have performed both of these latter tasks, and references to them and their works are frequently given in our columns. Imagination they cannot give you, but they can stimulate it. A useful primer is our little pamphlet called "Socialism," forty-eight pages packed with information for twopence. If after reading that you decide that Socialism is desirable and practicable, do not fold your arms and wait for something to happen, but do the only logical thing—join our organisation and help get it. Then when, as in a few months' time, the question is again staged, "is Capitalism to go on or go under?" be prepared to answer: "Under!" And being organised, you will be able to put Socialism in its place. What have you to lose? Nothing but your chains. To win? The whole world! You have a world to win. A world to win. W. T. H.

LECTURES Camberwell Branch, TRADE COUNCIL ROOM, 6a, Artichoke Place, Camberwell Green.

February 1st, 7.30 p.m.,

"SOCIALISM AND LABOUR CONFUSION."

Speaker, W. E. McHAFFIE

February 15th, 7.30 p.m.,

"CLASS CONSCIOUSNESS."

Speaker W. MILES.

FREE.—Questions and Discussion.

LECTURES WALTHAMSTOW CO-OP. HALL HOE STREET

SUNDAY, 3rd FEBRUARY, at 7.30 p.m.

"HOW TO VOTE."

Speaker, J. GINSBERG.

MARCH 3rd, at 7.30 p.m.

Speaker, E. LAKE.

THE CENSOR IN AUSTRALIA.

"SOCIALIST STANDARD" BARRED.

Mr. E. M. Higgins, a contributor to the Communist journal, "The Labour Monthly" (January, 1929), gives an account of the prohibition imposed by the Australian Federal Government on the importation of various publications.

The Australian Minister of Customs drew up, in December, 1927, and submitted to the Federal Parliament a list of 128 publications which are "prohibited, seized and forfeited." During 1928 some 40 publications were added to the list. It includes such works as "The Communist Manifesto," De Leon's "Two Pages from Roman History," all publications of the British Communist Party, many works which Mussolini's Government allows to circulate in Italy. Among the list of English periodicals are the "Labour Monthly," "The Worker," "Worker's Life" (Communist Party), and the SOCIALIST STANDARD.

The prohibition operates under the Customs Act, which empowers the authorities to exclude the import of certain goods by proclamation. "Seditious" literature has been "proclaimed," under a penalty of £100.

Such treatment of the SOCIALIST STANDARD is not, of course, new. Export was entirely prohibited from this country during the War, and we have also since the War been excluded from New Zealand.

While such exclusion naturally interferes with our sales, it is obviously useless for the object the Government has in view, i.e., the prevention of the spread of Socialist ideas. Capitalism, wherever it exists, inevitably leads to the growth of Socialist ideas among the workers.

The work of active propaganda for Socialism can be carried on just as well by native-born Australians as by foreigners. Socialist ideas are not confined to one country nor are they dependent on the written word of foreign residents. Our comrades in Australia are well able to organise their own propaganda, and are doing so with promising prospects. H.

YOUR Newsagent can obtain this journal from
Wholesale Agents: W. H. Smith & Son, Strand
House, W.C.

OFFICIAL NOTICE.

All communications for the Executive Committee, Subscriptions for the SOCIALIST STANDARD, Articles, and Correspondence submitted for insertion therein, should be addressed—The Socialist Party of Great Britain, 17, Mount Pleasant, London, W.C.1, to whom Money Orders should be made payable. The meetings of the Executive Committee are held at the Head Office, every Tuesday, at 7.30 p.m.

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTIONS.

Twelve Months, post free... 2s. 6d.
Six Months, post free... 1s. 3d.

The Socialist Standard,

FEB.



1929

THE GOOD TIME COMING!

This year; next year; sometime; never!

It is the duty of Bank Chairmen and Prime Ministers to make forecasts every year of the coming trade revival. They do this because it fills the mind of the unemployed with hope. This year Mr. Baldwin says:—

We may reasonably look forward, without being called unduly optimistic, to a general expansion of trade in the country. 'Daily Express, 21 December.)

Some people, remembering last year, and the year before, and the year before that, and so on, do not believe Mr. Baldwin. But those who believe and those who disbelieve, nearly all accept the assumption that if trade improved, then our problems would be solved. The Socialist does not accept this view. We point out that the workers are poor always, good trade or bad, and that the Capitalist class, whatever the state of trade, go on having a large and growing share of the wealth produced.

During the five years ended March 31st, 1927, less than 100,000 super-tax payers (90,000 in 1922/23 and 98,000 in 1926/27) had incomes totally over £500 millions a year. The total increased year by year from £516 millions to £568 millions.

The Tory says that unemployment would decline and wages rise if only we made more

articles at home and imported less from abroad. The Liberals and most of the Labourites say that unemployment would go if we could only sell more English goods abroad. It is interesting to notice that during 1928, as compared with 1927, both of these things have happened. More goods have been sold abroad and less goods imported. Comparing the first eleven months of 1928 with the same period of 1927, we find that imports fell by £18,475,254 (1.7 per cent.) and exports increased by £11,281,897 (1.5 per cent.). (See 'Economist,' December 15th.) Now let us look at the unemployment figures. The number of registered unemployed on November 28th, 1927, was 1,172,000, and on November 28th, 1928, 1,439,000. Observe, not a decrease, but an increase of 267,000! ('Ministry of Labour Gazette,' December, 1928.)

So much for Liberal, Labour and Conservative economic theories.

The facts are that an increase of exports and a decrease of imports may mean, but do not necessarily mean, that more wealth is being produced at home; and a decrease in foreign trade may coincide with an increase in production. Further, an increase in trade and an increase in production can both take place while, owing to the use of more machinery and improved methods, fewer workers are being employed. This is one of the effects of Capitalism, and the remedy is Socialism.

RECEIVED FOR REVIEW.**MARX'S CAPITAL.**

'Capital,' by Karl Marx. Allen & Unwin. 927 pages. 12s. 6d. Translated by Eden & Cedar Paul.

We regret that a review of this new translation of Marx's great work cannot appear in this issue, as our comrade engaged on this review is seriously ill. The review will, however, appear shortly.

A NEW EDITION.

'The Proletarian Revolution.' N. Lenin. (3s. cloth, 1s. 6d. paper.) Modern Books, Ltd.

The above book was reviewed in these columns on its first appearance. We then pointed out the weakness of Lenin's arguments against Kautsky.

Since that time no attempt has been made to justify Lenin's attitude. All we have is the repetition of Lenin's phrases.

'A Source Book of Social Psychology,' by Kimball Young. A. Knopf, 37, Bedford Square. 21s.

THE ECONOMIC LEAGUE ON CAPITAL.

In our January issue I dealt sympathetically with 'Some Socialist Fallacies Exploded'—a leaflet issued by that gifted but much misunderstood body, the Economic League, and it was shown how successfully they had blown sky-high the first 'fallacy' they had dealt with. Here follows the second 'Socialist' fallacy on their list for combustion:—

Fallacy No. 2.—*The interests of Capital and Labour are essentially antagonistic. Therefore, class warfare is necessary and inevitable.*

Not bad for a translation by such busy people! If you would prefer the original, however, it reads as follows:—

That society as at present constituted is based upon the ownership of the means of living (i.e., land, factories, railways, etc.) by the capitalist or master class, and the consequent enslavement of the working class by whose labour alone wealth is produced.

That in society, therefore, there is an antagonism of interests, manifesting itself as a class struggle, between those who possess but do not produce, and those who produce but do not possess.

Now you will hardly credit it, but these wild Socialists actually believe that this eccentric notion has historical justification to support it! Indeed, Engels, for example, in the preface to the 'Communist Manifesto,' has the impudence to assert:—

That in every historical epoch, the prevailing mode of economic production and exchange, and the social organisation necessarily following from it, form the basis upon which is built up, and from which alone can be explained, the political and intellectual history of that epoch; that consequently the whole history of mankind (since the dissolution of primitive tribal society, holding land in common ownership) has been a history of class struggles, contests between exploiting and exploited, ruling and oppressed classes: that the history of these class struggles forms a series of evolution in which, nowadays, a stage has been reached where the exploited and oppressed class—proletariat—cannot attain its emancipation from the sway of the exploiting and ruling class—the bourgeoisie—without, at the same time, and once and for all, emancipating society at large from all exploitation, oppression, class-distinctions and class struggles.

Class struggles, indeed! But the leaflet has different stuff from this to offer:—

This is another of the principles in the Socialist Manifesto. It is based on apparent ignorance of the facts that operative labour itself is actually a form of capital, and that the so-called class war or conflict between Labour and Capital is really nothing but a suicidal sort of contest between two

members of the same family. In evidence of the fact that labour is a form of capital, we have only to ask ourselves, What was man's original capital before he had any tools or plant to work with? The answer undoubtedly is that it was his innate capacity to invent and create, or, in other words, his labour, mental and physical; and so we arrive at the fundamental economic truth that operative labour is capital in its truest and most original sense, and that the interests of the two are, therefore, naturally and necessarily identical.

Could clarity be more pellucid? After sorting this out I arrive at the following conclusions: (1) Labour is a form of Capital, therefore presumably Capital has other forms; (2) 'Man's original Capital' was labour, and therefore this and the other forms of Capital not here specified must have been derived from Labour; and (3) because Labour is a form of Capital, and Capital is a form of Labour, therefore the interests of Capital, of which Labour is a form, are 'naturally and necessarily identical' with the interests of Labour, which is a form of Capital. Do you get that? ('Yes,' he lied glibly.)

One need not be an inmate of Banstead to believe that Capital and Labour are one as the law stands at present, but I admit a slight difficulty in comprehending how they can both be the same and yet, oh so different! However, perhaps the next passage may enlighten us:—

Mr. Dane tells us that 'a workman's character, skill and experience,' which constitute his labour, are 'as truly capital' as the tools and plant and machinery with which he works; and that fact teaches us another fundamental truth, that it is Labour which employs Capital, and not the other way about, as so many seem to think. The worker in a factory employs not only his own capital, but that of the owner of the factory as well, without, be it noted, any of the latter's financial risk. He is entirely dependent on both, and it is suicidal folly on his part to quarrel with his bread and butter, or, in other words, to wage war on what, after all, is his sole and only means of existence. It is perfectly true that one form of capital may refuse to employ the other, if, on the one hand, the financial risk is considered too great, or if, on the other hand, the remuneration is considered insufficient; but these differences of opinion are surely matters for amicable negotiation rather than for conflict. In any case, the fact remains that both forms of capital are absolutely dependent on each other.

For the first time, I now realise that 'a workman's character, skill and experience constitute his labour,' though obviously he has sometimes to take these attributes to bed with him! (In this case perhaps the 'labour' is done by proxy or correspondence.) One should always be careful, how-

ever, not to be vulgar, like Karl Marx, and include such qualities with physical and mental energy in what he calls *labour-power*. This is simply not done in the best economic circles. But I must agree that this *unperformed* labour of the worker is "as truly Capital as the tools and plant and machinery with which he works." We must take the word of such recondite "economists" as the Economic League that machinery, plant and tools are Capital. Even before their installation in the factory, even when the factory is "closed down," and most decidedly when they are thrown out of the factory on to a dust heap—they are still "Capital." I can almost understand this, but I confess to a wee difficulty in being able to comprehend (1) just when the machine, etc., becomes Capital, and (2) exactly what thickness of cobwebs or rust on a disused or unworked machine is necessary to accumulate before the machine ceases to be Capital—is it twelve inches or only six? You see, these Socialists have no respect at all for economic truths, and they guffaw rudely when people say that machinery, plant and tools are *in themselves* Capital. That Karl Marx of theirs can be very trying on this subject:—

Capital consists of raw materials, instruments of labour, and all kinds of means of life which are used to produce new raw materials, new instruments, and new means of life. All these component parts of capital are created by labour, products of labour, *stored-up labour*. Stored-up labour which serves as a means of new production is capital.

So say the economists.

What is a negro-slave? A man of the black race. The one definition is worthy of the other. A negro is a negro. He only becomes a slave under certain conditions. A cotton-spinning machine is a machine for spinning cotton. Only under certain conditions does it become capital. Torn from those conditions it is no more capital than gold itself is money, or sugar the price of sugar. (*Wage-Labour and Capital*.)

In other words, they say that these things (machinery, etc.) are only Capital during the time wage-labour is employed to operate them. But most diabolically of all, they claim that under Socialism even more and better machinery, plant and tools will be in use than at present, but they will be socially owned and will produce wealth for use only.

I was glad to find from this last-quoted passage that the Economic League make it clear that when they state that the interests of Capital and Labour are identical they mean the interests of the *owners* of Capital and the *owners* of wage-labour (i.e.,

workers), for this helps me to grasp their meaning when they state that "it is Labour which employs Capital, and not the other way about, as so many seem to think." If our capitalist wage-worker readers will bear this in mind, they should have little difficulty in recognising the aftcoming episode as an everyday experience of this simple fact:—

Scene: Dejected looking Capitalist diffidently approaching the sanctum of his prospective employer—an obese, complacent, prosperous looking wage-worker. Holding a cloth cap in his hand and looking down furtively at a big toe protruding from an aged boot, he musters up enough courage to tap upon the massive oak portal.

Voice of Wage-Worker from within: Come in!

Capitalist: Got a job, guv'nor? I bin sent by the Capiterlist Buroo. 'Ere's me perticlers, sir!

Wage-Worker: H'm! What can you do, my man?

Capitalist: I can own factories, plant and machinery, get you to work for me, pay you good money but not much of it, and keep all you produce for myself.

Wage-Worker: Good. Can you do anything else?

Capitalist: Well, you can't expect me to do anything else, guv'nor, now, can you? I ain't got much time to spend in this country, you know. I shall have to do the job from Cannes or Madeira, and perhaps sometimes from "Monty."

Wage-Worker: Right, you're engaged. I'll ring for my manager to start you at once, but see that I'm allowed to make plenty of profit for you or you and I will fall out. You get me?

Our sapient leafleteer then reminds us that Capital is Labour's bread and butter (no, not "marge"!) and it is silly for the worker to quarrel with his portion thereof. Well, as Capital and Labour are one, this dictum appears to apply equally to the Capitalist. This horrid spectacle of two slices of bread and butter engaging in a fratricidal struggle may be highly diverting to untutored minds, but I regard it as reprehensible in the extreme. Further, we are told the Capitalist is not only the "sole" but the "only" means of existence for the worker. (When he has finished the sole, apparently he comes on to the "only"!) Even the most perverse Socialists do not deny this fact. Indeed, Marx himself says something similar:—

To say that the interests of capital and the in-

terests of labour are identical means merely this: capital and wage labour are two sides of one and the same relation.

The one conditions the other, just as the usurer and the borrower mutually condition each other.

So long as the wage-worker remains a wage-worker, his lot is dependent upon capital. That is what the alleged identity of interests between worker and capitalist amounts to.

If capital grows, the mass of wage-labour grows, the number of wage-workers increases. In a word, the dominion of capital extends over a greater number of individuals. (*Wage-Labour and Capital*.)

Of course, the qualification is quite unnecessary!

Next we are told that the one form of Capital may refuse to employ the other. As, for example, when all the workers in an industry have simultaneously conferred upon them the freedom to enjoy the jollities of the kerbstone, whilst "the other form of Capital" is enduring the anguish of "financial risk" and sunstroke at Madeira. Of course, the worker does not incur "financial risk." When he asks for more wages—the suggestion is absurd! The million-and-a-half unemployed workers ought to feel more sympathy than they appear to express for the sorry plight of their capitalist brothers, brought on by "financial risk." The terrible ravages of the malady of "financial risk" may be only partially gauged by the perusal of the under-stated facts:—

About one-half of the entire income of the United Kingdom is enjoyed by about 12 per cent. of its population.

More than one-third of the entire income of the United Kingdom is enjoyed by about 3 per cent. of its population. (From Chiozza Money's "The Nation's Wealth," pp. 110-111.)

Let us take one of the main features of existing society—its division into two classes; a propertied class and a propertyless class. This is obviously the result of the ownership of the wealth of society by some of the people, to the exclusion of the others, for this alone produces a class of possessors and a class of non-possessors.

With regard to the ownership of property, Mr. Zorn has shown (*Daily News*, November 29th, 1919) that 10 per cent. of the population owns 99 per cent. of the wealth, while the remaining 1 per cent. is divided among nine-tenths of the people. And Professor Clay tells us that—

it is probably safe to say that over two-thirds of the national capital is held by less than 2 per cent. of the people.—*Times*, 24th March, 1925.

So the two-class nature of the present social scheme is directly traceable to that form of private property which excludes one class from ownership. (From *Socialism*, p. 28.)

I trust the recital of these facts will enlighten the reader as to the identity of

interests between the wage-slaves and their masters, and that he will point out the selfishness of the workers in allowing their capitalist brothers to suffer in silence these agonies of "financial risk."

I regret my space ration forbids me to do justice to the admirable way in which the Economic League view Capital and Labour in all its aspects and in all historical epochs. The primitive tools of the communistic tribesman, the implements of the handicraftsman, the merchant's capital, the mediæval usurer's money capital, the giant machines, factories, etc., of to-day, the great financial corporations, labour under all conditions (of the communistic savage, the chattel slave, the feudal serf, the handicraftsman and the wage-worker)—all these are Capital in the eyes of the Economic League. Their argument seems, therefore, to be: As mines, mills, workshops, etc., are Capital, and as Socialists mean to abolish Capital, therefore there cannot be mines, mills, workshops, etc., under Socialism. Which, I think, is quite good, don't you, reader?

There are still three more explosions of "fallacies" in the leaflet, so, all being well, there should be a real "Brock's benefit" for our next issue.

SARCASTIGATOR.

EAST LONDON.

LECTURES

ON

SOCIALISM

AT

CIRCLE HOUSE, GT. ALIE STREET,
ALDGATE,

Sunday, February 24th, at 7.30 p.m.

Speaker - A. JACOBS.

Sunday, March 31, at 7.30 p.m.

Speaker - J. UTTIN

Admission Free.

Questions and Discussion.

GET TOGETHER!

Readers of the "Socialist Standard" who desire to be put into communication with other readers in their district are invited to notify the General Secretary, at 17 Mount Pleasant, W.C.1.

THE FAMILY ALLOWANCES FRAUD.

Since the I.L.P. have adopted family allowances as one of the items in their programme of reforms, it would not be out of place to enquire into it and see whether this particular reform has any lasting benefits to confer upon the working class. Can the scheme be brought into being, and if so with what effects?

For those unacquainted with the scheme, I will state the broad outlines, and must refer them to Eleanor Rathbone's book, "The Disinherited Family," for fuller details.

The scheme was talked of before the War, but nothing definite came of it until the years 1916-18. A Committee then sat, including Mr. H. N. Brailsford, a prominent member of the I.L.P., and enquired into the cost and the method of application. They were inspired by the Government war-time separation allowance scheme, noting the good effects resulting from the working-class mother having a regular, if small, allowance paid to her at stated times.

The Committee still exists to propagate the idea, and the I.L.P. now stands pledged to support and make it law when they possess the power to do so.

The scheme has a "high moral tone." It aims at giving to every family even the lowest on the industrial ladder (just fancy, even the lowest) the material means for healthy living and of placing the service of motherhood in the position of honour and security which it merits. (Miss Rathbone's words in page 11 of the introduction to her book, "The Disinherited Family.")

The material means are to be financial assistance by means of allowances paid to the parent (preferably the mother) for every dependent child she has. This can be arranged in two ways. The Labour supporters prefer a State-controlled scheme; the money coming from taxation of the wealthy and paid through the Post Office. The more cautious supporters believe in a "horizontal distribution" among the wage-earners, the employers thus paying for the scheme.

Perhaps this term needs a little explanation. The idea is that the single worker shall receive wages based upon a mere subsistence level, the amount to be increased according to the measure of his responsibilities. Thus, the employer actually saves

on his wages bill until his male workers marry and have children.

Although this would seem to cause the employer to favour the labour of single workers as against married, there are many clauses that could be introduced to remedy this fact. A law compelling employers to employ a certain percentage of married workers might be passed, but I must refer my readers to the previously mentioned book for details upon this item.

The scheme has been introduced in several ways in a few Continental countries, but so far there have been no startling reports of the increased wealth, happiness and contentment of the workers in those countries.

France introduced the scheme at a time when it was needed to offer every inducement to the workers to work harder and to re-populate the country owing to the ravages of the War. The workers were not in a position in which they could afford to disregard the masters' threat to stop their families' allowances if they went on strike. One firm's workers struck in sympathy with their fellows who were killed in an industrial dispute elsewhere. The result was that they lost their allowance for two months.

One seems to have lost touch with the high moral tone.

In Germany there was need for frantic production to pay the war debts. Again came the family allowance to light the way. It is a light that soon fades.

From Switzerland comes the report that the family allowances resulted in more production and less industrial unrest. What a wonderful weapon for the master it is. What a glorious recognition of parentage!

Let us now examine the scheme for its application to this country.

Miss Rathbone, in her book, says, when talking of the poverty and destitution in the coal-mining areas, that the discontent is not unjustified, even if the remedies asked for are. We are left to infer that the remedy advocated by her, *i.e.*, Family Endowment, will satisfy the needs of these people and avert industrial disputes. Indeed, at a lecture to the Annual Conference of the Faculty of Insurance, April 2nd, 1927, reprinted in the "Insurance Magazine," July, 1927, she said quite definitely that the scheme would prove very anti-revolutionary and prevent Labour from dislocating industry. The methods call for

discussion now, and the I.L.P.'s favourite method I will discuss first.

To levy taxes on incomes over a certain amount means hitting the Capitalists in their most vital spot, *i.e.*, their pockets. Is it likely that they can be persuaded to consent to this taxation? Most certainly not. Then the only course left open is to enforce the taxes upon them. If the I.L.P. has a majority in the House and a Socialist backing outside, which alone will enable them to enforce their commands, there would be no need for the family allowance. Socialism would then be practicable and the reform useless.

The other, and most workable to the Capitalist eye, is the "horizontal distribution" stunt. No extra money is here needed. Wages will be graded. The single people will be paid on the basis of the cost of living of an unmarried person. Married men with no children will receive the amount necessary to keep a wife. The total wages bill of the Capitalist remains unchanged. As the children appear they will be allowed for and the money paid, not as wages but as a child's allowance to the selected parent.

Miss Rathbone justifies her scheme on the ground that the present method of providing for many non-existent children and leaving those already here unprovided, is unscientific, but if it is unscientific for a single worker to get as much as a married worker why is Miss Rathbone indifferent to the enormous wealth of nonworkers, *i.e.*, the Capitalist class? If it is unfair that a single man should receive that amount which his married comrade with children gets, the remedy lies not in decreasing the single man's already insufficient share, but in organising society so that every person gets the wherewithal to live decently and with the greatest amount of comfort that the community can afford. Far from desiring this, Miss Rathbone opposes it. Her scheme is intended, not for everyone, but only for the workers. Its object is to stave off Socialism.

For the advocates of family allowances the workers are so many cattle in a market, and their fodder is to be rationed according as they reproduce their kind or not.

It is to this kind of calculating hypocrisy that the I.L.P. lend their support.

To Miss Rathbone I would say that her time would have been better spent had she written two pages telling working women

how to free themselves and their children from the economic slavery by which they are enthralled, instead of three or four hundred pages showing how to bring more working-class children into the world at less expense to the Capitalist class; but then of course, she would not receive the support of Capitalist Governments and the I.L.P. and Labour supporters. MAY OTWAY.

PARLIAMENT AND THE ARMY. THE CURRAGH "MUTINY."

Arising out of the article "What is the Use of Parliament," in our January issue, a correspondent writes pointing out that the refusal in 1914 of British Army officers to obey the Asquith Government if ordered to attack the Ulster "rebels," shows that the Army can successfully defy Government and Parliament.

Before dealing with the incident in question, it may be as well to restate the claim made by the Socialist Party with regard to control of Parliament. Our view is that control of Parliament, secured by the return of a majority of Socialists in an election fought simply on the issue of Socialism versus Capitalism, implying as of course it does that the big majority of the working class understand and want Socialism, would give effective control of the political machinery, including the armed forces.

Let us see, then, in what way the Curragh "mutiny" bears on our contention. In the first place, our correspondent has his facts all wrong. There was no "mutiny," no evidence of an intention to mutiny, no defiance of the Government and no defiance of Parliament or the majority of the electors.

Asquith's Government was not elected on the issue of Home Rule for Ireland and the coercion of Ulster, but predominantly on the issue of the House of Lords' veto. Further, its majority at the December (1910) election was greatly reduced from its majority at the January (1910) election, and it was confidently believed by the Conservatives that the next election would give a majority to them. Asquith's Government had therefore no direct evidence that the majority of the electorate were behind them on the Ulster question. On the other hand, it was the view of influential Army officers also that elections at no distant date would put the Liberals out of office. (See "Biography of Sir Henry Wilson," by Sir

Charles Callwell, *Sunday Times*, May 22nd, 1927.)

Even, therefore, if the Curragh officers had decided to disobey orders, they would have done so with good reason to believe that their attitude would be endorsed by the electorate and the new Government. That situation, quite the reverse of the situation which would exist after the return of a Socialist majority at an election fought on the issue of Socialism, invalidates the comparison between the "mutiny" in 1914 and a hypothetical mutiny by anti-Socialist Army officers against the orders of a Government backed by a Socialist Parliamentary majority and a Socialist electorate.

Secondly, and doubtless wholly or partly because of their doubt as to the views of the electorate, Asquith's Government never showed that it seriously intended to force the issue. On the contrary, its indecisive attitude indicates fairly clearly that it had no such intention.

But whether that was its intention or not, the fact is that it did not order the Army leaders to take action against the Ulster forces. What it did was to offer them the choice between taking such action or resigning their commissions. Given such a choice, and knowing that there was good reason to expect a not far distant return of a Conservative Government, prudence, if nothing else, would naturally suggest to the officers concerned the advisability of taking the course of resigning since it offered them more promising future prospects.

Thus, General Sir Hubert Gough, in an interview (*Manchester Guardian*, February 4th, 1919), said:—

I never refused to obey orders. On the contrary, I obeyed them. I was ordered to make a decision—namely, to leave the Army or "to undertake active operations against Ulster." These were the very words of the terms offered. As I was given a choice, I accepted it, and chose the first alternative; and, as a matter of fact, I have a letter in existence, written the night before the offer was made by Sir A. Paget to my brother, saying: "Something is up" (we had been suddenly ordered to a conference). "What is it? If I receive orders to march north, of course I will go."

Mr. Tim Healy, in his memoirs, "Letters and Leaders of My Time," supports this view. He says:—

The Curragh mutiny thus occurred through the attempt to "feel the pulse" of the officers privately instead of giving them orders to march—which they would have obeyed. (Quoted in *Manchester Guardian*, 12th December, 1928.)

We see, then, that the incidents at the Curragh do not in any way conflict with our insistence on the need for the working class to secure the control of Parliament.

H.

A PROFESSOR SMASHES MARX'S THEORIES.

Professor Thomas Nixon Carver, who has held the chair of Political Economy at Harvard University for twenty-six years, "smashes" Marxism in the usual style in the American "Current History" magazine. In his contribution to the debate on "Marxism To-day," he starts his attack by referring to Marx, thus:—

The most complete exposition of doctrines based on this fundamental premise is found in the writings of Karl Marx, particularly in "Das Kapital." He was a philosopher and capable of reasoning clearly enough, and he had the courage, which many lack, to follow his reasoning to its ultimate conclusions. The difficulty is not with his reasoning. It is with the assumption with which he starts. Any one who accepts that assumption must follow him to the bitter end. If we start with a different assumption and reason with equal accuracy, we reach a very different set of conclusions.

What this "assumption" is we are not told. And consequently Prof. Carver leaves the issue untouched.

As a general argument against Marx, we are told that "prosperity is more widely diffused in capitalistic countries than in non-capitalistic countries," and that "capital is a means of earning wealth by adding to the wealth of others."

The prosperity of capitalist countries compared with others is due to the rapid development of industry on a large scale. This industry is operated by the working class. And the so-called prosperity is that of the owners, while the wage-working producers remain poor as a class in every country.

Prof. Carver apparently thinks that Socialists object to Capitalism as a mistake or monstrosity, whereas we recognise its place in social evolution as a pre-condition for the coming of Socialism. The very development that led to modern Capitalism, so ably sketched by Marx, is childishly used by this "great" American professor as an argument against Marx!

The Professor says that the concentration of wealth can go on along with diffused ownership. How much diffused? Instead

of showing that in actual life concentration and diffusion proceed together, he leaves this task and accuses Marx of laying down an "iron law of wages." He says:—

"There is, of course, even according to the Marxian theory, a lower limit to the poverty of the masses. They must be given enough to enable them to work and to reproduce their kind, at least in sufficient numbers to stock the labour market. Even livestock, including slaves, must be given that much if the owners are to make anything out of them. What the Marxian calls "wage slaves," and what others call "free labourers," can never get any more under the capitalistic system. This is the so-called iron law of wages. The labour cost theory of value is not Marxian, but was taken over from the economists of the eighteenth century."

This great idol of Individualists in America with a big reputation as an economist has the nerve to attack Marx without reading him. In "Capital" as well as "Value, Price and Profit," Marx showed that the workers must struggle continually with the employers over hours and wages to prevent their standards sinking. Nowhere did Marx state an "iron law of wages"; in fact, in his criticism of the Gotha Programme he specially set to oppose that so-called law which was the pet idea of Lassalle. The iron law of wages of Lassalle said that wages cannot fall or rise for long above bare subsistence, because if wages increased for any time the wage-workers would have more children, and if wages fell continually for some time the workers would have much fewer offspring. So the increase or decrease of competing workers would adjust wages once again to the iron law. Marx, on the other hand, while showing that on the average the workers obtained the cost of their subsistence, only got this by means of struggle. He pointed out that historical and social factors entered into changing standards of living and that the idea that you cannot raise wages held by Malthusians like Citizen Weston (in Value, Price and Profit) was opposed to the facts of economic life.

The "iron law of wages" theory might be called a mixture of Karl Marx and Marie Stopes.

Finally, the Professor says: "Capital is not predatory; it is productive. It equips industries," etc. The equipment is capital, Mr. Carver states. If so, who produces the

equipment? Not the owners, but the working class. Who operates the equipment? Again, the workers.

Is the Capitalist productive? Most modern Capitalists are shareholders in concerns where the entire work is carried on by hired workers, plainly showing the parasitic nature of the owning class.

Prof. Carver never attempts to show that there is no exploitation of the workers, but indulges in weak evasions and misrepresentations like those referred to. So Marx is "smashed" again by the "hot air" of an economic professor. A. KOHN.

Contributions are earnestly invited to assist us with the expense of publishing more literature.

CENTRAL LONDON.

LECTURES

AT

THE MINERVA CAFE

HIGH HOLBORN

(Entrance in Bury St.)

Saturday, 2nd February	Com. BELLINGHAM
" 9th "	" KOHN
" 16th "	" FAIRBROTHER
" 23rd "	" GINSBERG

Door opens 7.30 p.m. Commence 8 p.m.

(These meetings are held under auspices of the auspices of the Clerkenwell Branch.)

S.P.G.B. PROPAGANDA MEETINGS

LONDON DISTRICT.

Sundays	... Clapham Common, 3 p.m. Tottenham, West Green Corner, 11.30 a.m. Tooting, Garrett Lane, Tooting Broadway, 7.30 p.m. Victoria Park, 4 p.m. Woolwich, Beresford Square, 7.30 p.m. Hyde Park, 11.30 p.m. Paddington, Prince of Wales, 8 p.m.
Mondays	... Paddington, Prince of Wales, 8 p.m. Clerkenwell, Garnault Place, 8 p.m.
Wednesdays	... Hackney, Paragon Road and Mare Street, 8 p.m. Paddington, Prince of Wales, 8 p.m.
Thursdays	... Becontree, Rodney Street, Ilford, 8 p.m.
Fridays	... Clerkenwell, Acton, St., Grays Inn Rd., 8 p.m. West Ham, Water Lane, 8 p.m.
Saturdays	... Wood Green, Jolly Butchers Hill, 8 p.m. Leyton, Corner Grange Park, 7.30 p.m.

HANLEY BRANCH.

Sundays	... Hanley Market Square, 7 p.m. Burslem, St. John Square, 7 p.m.
---------	--

BRANCH DIRECTORY.

- BATTERSEA.**—Sec., 2, Hanbury-road, S.W.11. Branch meets Thursday, 8.30 p.m. at The Waiting Room, Latchmere Baths, entrance in Burns-road. Discussion second Thurs. in month.
- BECONTREE.**—Sec., Hy. Gratton, 4, Drummond Ave., Brooklands, Romford. Branch meets 1st and 3rd Wednesdays at 7.30, at above address.
- BIRMINGHAM.**—Sec. E. Jesper, 88, Rollason-rd., Erdington. Branch meets The Continental Café, Moor St., 1st and 3rd Sundays at 11 a.m.
- CAMBERWELL.**—Branch meets at Camberwell Trades Council Room, 6A, Artichoke Place, Camberwell Green, every Friday at 8.30 p.m. Discussions—public invited. Letters to Secretary at above address.
- CENTRAL.**—Membership obtained only through the Ex. Committee. Applications to General Sec.
- CLERKENWELL.**—Branch meets Wednesdays, 8 p.m., at 17, Mount Pleasant, W.C.1. Discussions first Wednesday in month at 8 p.m.—all invited. Sec., at above address.
- EAST LONDON.**—Sec., D. Jacobs, 28, Lyal Road, Bow, E.3. Branch meets 1st and 3rd Mondays at 8 p.m. at Stewart's Cafe, 195, Cambridge Rd., E.2.
- GLASGOW.**—Sec. W. Falconer, 128, Bluevale Street.
- HACKNEY.**—Branch meets The Old Gravel Pit Hall, Mare-street, Hackney, Mondays, 8 p.m.. Discussions 9.30. Communication to Sec. as above.
- HANLEY.**—Branch meets Tuesdays, Working Men's Club, Glass-st. Sec., F. Goldstraw, 38, Paddock Street, Hanley.
- ISLINGTON.**—Branch meets Wednesdays, 8.30, at 144, Seven Sister-rd., Holloway, N. Sec., A. Gregory, 24, Goodinge Rd., N.7.
- LEYTON.**—Sec., A. Holland, 396, Lea Bridge-rd., Leyton. Branch meets 8 p.m., Trades and Labour Hall, Grove House, High-rd., second Mondays in month.
- MANCHESTER.**—Sec., W. Addison, 111, West Park-street, Salford, Manchester.—Branch meets 1st and 3rd Thursdays in month, 7.45 p.m., at 114, Duke St., Stretford-road.
- PADDINGTON.**—Branch meeting held on 2nd and 4th Fridays, 8 p.m., in room above the Co-operative Stores, 306, Kilburn-lane, W.9 (side door).
- SOUTHEND-ON-SEA.**—Sec., J. Bird, 5 Wellington-avenue, Westcliffe-on-Sea.
- TOOTING.**—Sec., 15, University-road, Collier's Wood, S.W. 19. Branch meets every Friday at 8 p.m. at Tooting Adult School, 971, Garratt-lane, S.W. 17.
- TOTTENHAM.**—Secretary, 18, Woodlands Park Rd., N. 15. Branch meets Fridays, Room 2, Trades Hall, 7, Bruce Grove. Discussion after branch business. Public invited.
- WALTHAMSTOW.**—Sec., S. E. Williams, 3, Dyson-rd., Leytonstone, E.11. Branch meets at Workmen's Hall, High-st., every Monday.
- WATFORD.**—A. Lawson, Sec., 107 Kensington-avenue, Watford. Branch meets Mondays at 8.30 p.m. at Secretary's address.

- WEST HAM.**—Branch meets Thursdays at 8 p.m. at 167 Romford rd., Stratford. Sec., P. Hallard, 22, Colegrave-rd., Stratford, E.
- WOOD GREEN.**—All communications to Sec., F. W. Godfrey, 71, Falkland Road, N.8.
- WOOLWICH.**—Branch meets at 94, Griffin Road, Plumstead. Communications to Secretary at above address.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN.

OBJECT.—The establishment of a system of society based upon the common ownership and democratic control of the means and instruments for producing and distributing wealth by and in the interests of the whole community.

DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain

That society as at present constituted is based upon the ownership of the means of living (i.e., land, factories, railways, etc.) by the capitalist or master class, and the consequent enslavement of the working class by whose labour alone wealth is produced.

That in society, therefore, there is an antagonism of interests, manifesting itself as a class struggle, between those who possess but do not produce and those who produce but do not possess.

That this antagonism can be abolished only by the emancipation of the working class from the domination of the master class, by the conversion into the common property of society of the means of production and distribution, and their democratic control by the whole people.

That as in the order of social evolution the working class is the last class to achieve its freedom, the emancipation of the working class will involve the emancipation of all mankind, without distinction of race or sex.

That this emancipation must be the work of the working class itself.

That as the machinery of government, including the armed forces of the nation, exists only to conserve the monopoly by the capitalist class of the wealth taken from the workers, the working class must organise consciously and politically for the conquest of the powers of government, national and local, in order that this machinery, including these forces, may be converted from an instrument of oppression into the agent of emancipation and the overthrow of privilege, aristocratic and plutocratic.

That as political parties are but the expression of class interests, and as the interest of the working class is diametrically opposed to the interests of all sections of the master class, the party seeking working-class emancipation must be hostile to every other party.

The SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain, therefore, enters the field of political action determined to wage war against all other political parties, whether alleged labour or avowedly capitalist, and calls upon the members of the working class of this country to muster under its banner to the end that a speedy termination may be wrought to the system which deprives them of the fruits of their labour, and that poverty may give place to comfort, privilege to equality, and slavery to freedom.

Those agreeing with the above principles and desiring enrolment in the Party should apply for membership form to secretary of nearest branch or at Head Office.

THE Socialist Standard

The Official Organ of **THE SOCIALIST PARTY** of Great Britain.

No. 295. Vol. 25.]

LONDON, MARCH, 1929.

[MONTHLY, TWOPENCE.]

"CAPITAL," BY KARL MARX. A REVIEW.

A New Translation of Marx's famous work, "Capital," by Eden & Cedar Paul, from the Fourth German Edition, the final edition revised by Engels. Published by George Allen & Unwin, Ltd., Museum Street, London, W.C.1. Price 12/6 net.

The first volume of Karl Marx's masterly analysis of capitalist production, entitled "Capital," was published in German in 1867. In the preface he stated that other volumes were in preparation, and outlined the portions of the subject with which each would deal. Unfortunately he did not live long enough to see these latter volumes through the press, and it was left for his life-long friend and co-worker, Frederick Engels, to construct volumes 2 and 3 out of the mass of material left by Marx, aided to a very large extent by his own great knowledge both of the subject itself and of Marx's views and intentions.

A second edition of volume 1 appeared in German in 1873 and Marx was preparing the materials for a third edition in 1883 when he died. Engels saw this third edition through the press, with such alterations as Marx had indicated in the manuscript, in November, 1883.

It was from this edition that the first translation of volume 1 into English was made in 1886 by Mr. Samuel Moore and Dr. Aveling, under the general editorship of Engels (who took responsibility for the work as a whole) and published by Swan, Sonnenschein & Co., of London. A fourth edition in German was published by Engels in 1890. In the meantime, Engels had published Volume 2 in 1885 (a second edition in 1893), and Volume 3 appeared in 1894. From the materials left behind by Marx and Engels, Karl Kautsky has published three

volumes under the title "Theories of Surplus Value."

The Sonnenschein edition has been out of print for some years and now a new translation from the fourth German edition has been prepared by Eden and Cedar Paul, and published by George Allen & Unwin, Ltd.

For some reason not easy to discover, these publishers have gone out of their way in a stupid attempt to disparage the translation supervised by Engels. On the paper cover to the book they state:—

This great work has hitherto been available only in a somewhat unliterary translation made from the third German edition, which was not the final edition.

What is "literary" or "unliterary" may be a matter of opinion, but we are quite certain that the majority of readers will hold that the present translation—as far as comparisons can be made—is no way superior, if as good as, the Sonnenschein edition. Thus the use of the ugly word "machinofacture" in place of "modern industry" will hardly seem an improvement to many. Neither is the word "febrile" in any way superior to the word "feverish" as used by Engels, while to talk of the "spiritual" wants of the workers (p. 232), where Engels says "intellectual" is in contradiction to Marx's essential views. And it may be remarked that the Sonnenschein edition was translated from the latest German edition available at the time.

Neither is it entirely true to say that only the Sonnenschein edition has been available in English. For, if it is agreed that the American language is English, then Kerr

& Co., of Chicago, published a translation of the third German edition "revised and amplified according to the fourth German edition by Ernest Untermann," in 1906 that has been on sale here. Untermann also translated the second and third volumes of "Capital" into English. Therefore the matter, if not a word for word translation of the fourth German edition, has been available here. Following the Russian fashion of numeration, we may perhaps call it the three and a half edition!

The chief additions in the fourth edition as compared with the third are the footnote on Bimetallism (p. 125); the footnote on the Factory and Workshops Act (p. 545), four pages of text (642-645) on "Surplus Value Transformed into Capital," and three pages of text (691-694) on "Law of Capitalist Accumulation." The latter section is of special interest because, in addition to treating of credit, it deals with a detail of development—centralisation of capital into the hands of a few—that Marx had been accused of failing to foresee by certain Fabian critics.

While the present translation is a new one direct from the fourth German edition, it is interesting to note the translators' statement in their preface:—

Of course Moore & Aveling's translation, which appeared in 1886, and J.B.'s translation of the first nine chapters (Bellamy Library), have not been ignored; the former, in particular, deserved close study, as it was published under the auspices of Frederick Engels.... In the present version we have relied throughout upon the definitive German text as final arbiter.

It may be mentioned that "J. B.'s" translation is a very poor one and was severely criticised by Engels when it appeared.

The translators are to be congratulated on one decision. "Capital" is a book intended primarily for working-class readers, the majority of whom have little or no opportunity of acquiring a knowledge of foreign languages. Marx's work abounds in quotations from Greek, Italian, French, etc., that form stumbling-blocks to the average worker. The translators decided to give all these quotations in English without unduly burdening the volume with the original languages, a course which, in our opinion, was the right one to take.

Some printer's errors occur that should receive attention when the next edition is being prepared. On page 15 the word "twice" is, of course, redundant. The

word "being," page 49 (sixth line from bottom) is a misprint for "bring." In the second paragraph, page 102, the word "diminishes" should be replaced by "increases." On page 391 the description of one of the mechanical powers as an "oblique" plane is incorrect, the proper term being "inclined" plane. The word "not" on page 437 is a misprint for "now."

This new volume, with its black cover and gold lettering, has a striking appearance and is well bound and printed, but one wishes at times that the paper had been a little more opaque, as in several places the print from the other side of the sheet shows through. The price of 12s. 6d., though, unfortunately, high for a worker's pocket, is certainly cheap for a technical work as books are priced to-day.

But the importance of its contents and the vast store of information it contains renders it a volume well worthy of some sacrifice on the part of a worker to obtain a copy.

J. FITZGERALD.

SPECIAL NOTICE.

NEW PREMISES.

We expect to be established in our new offices by end of March or beginning of April at

42, GREAT DOVER STREET, S.E.1.
Close to Borough Station (Underground).

ISLINGTON.

A LECTURE

will be given at

144, SEVEN SISTERS ROAD, N.7.
(Entrance Thane Villas).

WEDNESDAY, March 13th, at 8 o'clock.

Com. E. LAKE, on

"SOCIALISM AND THE MODERN
UTOPIANS."

also

WEDNESDAY, March 27.

Com. W. E. BROWN, on

"ARE LABOUR PARTY REFORMS OF
USE TO THE WORKING CLASS."

ADMISSION FREE.

QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION.

SPOILING THE EGYPTIANS.

BRITISH CAPITALISM AND EGYPTIAN NATIONALISM.

British Imperialism in Egypt. By Elinor Burns. No. 5, Colonial Series. Published by the Labour Research Department. 72 pp. Price 6d.

This book is a very succinct and useful account of British control in Egypt from about 1850 to the present day.

From 1517 to 1914, Egypt was nominally under Turkish rule, and was required to pay an annual tribute, fixed in 1873 at £675,000, but during the 19th century a new overlord entered Egypt—the foreign financier—who demanded tribute on an immensely larger and ever-increasing scale.

Foreign capital was given its first opportunity by the construction of the Suez Canal during the reign of the Khedive Ismail, who was the first Egyptian ruler to foresee prospects of wealth and power by developing the country's resources on West European lines. The first twelve years of Ismail's reign call to mind the famous tribute to the "bourgeoisie" in the Communist Manifesto for, during this period, the following, among many other works, were completed: The construction of the Suez Canal and 8,400 miles of irrigation canals; over 900 miles of railways and 5,000 miles of telegraph; the building of 430 bridges and numerous houses in Cairo; the Alexandria harbour and the Suez Docks; the construction of roads, including a special road to the Pyramids; and the completion of 15 lighthouses and 64 sugar mills. Irrigation increased the area of arable land from four million to nearly five-and-a-half million acres. Most of these works were carried out by British capitalists who lent the money at immense interest and obtained enormous profits on their contracts. In a short space of time these capitalists were owed by the Egyptian State more than a half of the money lent, and the bulk of revenue was required for debt redemption. More and more loans were contracted to pay off other loans, and the finances of the country became in such a hopeless condition that excuse was afforded for the British Government to "step in" in the interest of its "nationals"—the bondholders and financiers. The Khedive in 1875 was compelled by the creditors to sell his shares in the Suez Canal to the British Government for £4,000,000, and a financial mission was sent to Egypt "to assist in remedying the

confusion." Following this decision, Goschen, the representative of the bondholders, and the financial mission, forced upon the Khedive a scheme which included the appointment of two Controllers-General (one British, one French), and the consolidation of the debt at 7 per cent. interest (except on the loans of Goschen's firm on which the old rates of 10 and 12 per cent. were to be paid!) Ruthless pressure was put upon the peasants to keep the State finances solvent. Crops were forestalled, and customs dues and railway rates were increased. Despite the occurrence of a cattle plague and a failure of crops, which led to a holocaust of deaths from starvation and disease, the British Government would not allow even postponement of interest payments. Repercussions followed elsewhere; salaries of soldiers and Civil Servants were unpaid and their numbers seriously reduced. The Egyptian Finance Minister who protested against foreign control, was "put out of the way." At last, in 1879, a revolt in the Army and widespread discontent, compelled the Khedive to dismiss the foreign ministers and to institute, through an elected assembly of Sheiks and others, a native government. This gave birth to a National Party, whose slogan was "Egypt for the Egyptians."

However, High Finance was not prepared to take this blow "lying down." The British Government induced the Sultan of Turkey to depose the Khedive Ismail and to appoint Tewfik, a tool of the foreign interests, as his successor. A few weeks later the foreign Controllers General were re-installed in office, and agitation for Egyptian Independence received a further stimulus.

The Army, now the only native institution within the State machine, was the leading force in this movement, and an officer named Arabi, a former "ranker" of peasant origin, became its storm centre. The movement received support also from the landlords, who objected to foreign exploitation of Egypt's new resources, and the peasants, who were being bled white by taxes for debt service. A programme was drawn up, which included the dismissal of all ministers, the granting of a constitution, and an increase in the strength of the Army. To stifle the agitation, the Khedive ordered Arabi and his regiment to the provinces, but Arabi refused to go, and instead marched his troops to the Palace

and compelled the Khedive to appoint a new Anti-Imperialist Ministry.

Shortly after the events recorded above a massacre of Christians by a hired band of Bedouins took place at Alexandria. Whether the massacre was instigated by the British or the Turks is obscure, but the effect was harmful from a British point of view, for the European residents demanded the recognition of Arabi and the setting up of a joint conference of the six Powers having interests in Egypt—France, England, Italy, Germany, Austria and Russia.

The conference met at Constantinople in June, 1882, and a protocol was signed on behalf of the respective governments renouncing exclusive territorial and commercial privileges, and agreeing that none of the Powers should take isolated action in Egypt *except in case of special emergency*. As exclusive British control was impossible under this arrangement, it was imperative that a "special emergency" should arise, and a pretext was soon found to justify a British occupation of Egypt. The repairing of some forts at Alexandria by the Egyptians was seized upon by the British Government as an excuse to bombard Alexandria by warships on July 11th, 1882. Troops were landed to "restore order" on the Nile, and Arabi and his followers, who showed resistance, were finally routed at Tel-el-Kebir. Thus the British occupation became an accomplished fact, and the other Powers were not at the time in a position to assert their own "rights" under the protocol. The dual control was abolished, and the Egyptian constitution and Assembly were replaced by councils whose powers were merely advisory. Egypt for the next 25 years was treated to the "humane" administration of the British Consul-General, Sir Evelyn Baring, a London financier, who was afterwards made Lord Cromer for "services rendered."

The Baring regime introduced a new era of economic development. It was seen that the continued impoverishment of the peasants would lead to loss of revenue through land going out of cultivation. Accordingly the production of cotton on a greater scale for export was encouraged. This, in turn, created a demand for products of British heavy industry, for vast irrigation works and light railways, and, strangely enough, for foodstuffs, which were not now a paying proposition for the

Egyptian peasant. In 1907 the exports of cotton were worth £30,000,000 as against £8,000,000 in 1892; and in 1908 foodstuffs to the value of £5,000,000 were imported, though a few years previously Egypt was a self-supporting country. It would be impossible in this article to trace the rapid industrialisation of Egypt to the present day, but some idea may be obtained from the estimate of the amount of British capital invested in Egypt, which is stated in this book to be about £200,000,000, on which the sum taken by British capitalists in interest and profits is given as £20,000,000.

Under the Baring administration the "key" positions in the Civil Service, Local Administration and the Army were held by Britishers, but as time went on it was found necessary to placate the class of rising Egyptian capitalists and large landowners which capitalist development had brought into being, and concessions had to be made continually to these sections. Saad Zaghlul Pasha, for example, was made Minister of Public Instruction in 1906. Nevertheless, control of the Egyptian State machine has never been relaxed by the British capitalist interests, and a persistent struggle between the Egyptian native capitalists and the British capitalists has been going on up to the present day. The political history of Egypt since 1906 has been a record of demonstrations, strikes, assassinations, riots and armed revolts on the one hand and of bloody repression, judicial atrocities, bombings, imprisonments, martial law, deportations; interspersed with attempts at compromise, on the other. Prior to the European War, Mustapha Kemel had been largely instrumental in organising the students, and by street demonstrations and the publication of newspapers, which had large circulations, the question of Egyptian "independence" was kept to the fore. By 1914 the movement had become so menacing that in November of that year Egypt was put under martial law. A rigorous press censorship was instituted; in December a British Protectorate was declared, and the pro-Turkish Khedive Abbas was deposed in favour of Hussein, who was given the title of Sultan. Although the British Government declared publicly that Egyptians would not be required for war service, yet within a year tens of thousands of peasants and workers were "rounded up" and compelled to join the Labour Corps and the Camel Transport

Corps. The total number computed to have been enlisted in this manner in the various forces was about 1,000,000. Such measures as these induced violent hatred of British rule and popular support of the Nationalist movement. Further, the hypocritical talk in Allied journals about "self-determination" and the rights of "small nationalities" was seized upon by the Nationalists as inflammable propaganda and in order to harass the Government. Soon after the Armistice an Egyptian delegation (Wafd) was formed under Zaghlul Pasha to proceed to London in order to discuss the question of Egyptian "independence" with the British Government, but passports were refused and Zaghlul and three members of the Wafd were subsequently arrested and deported to Malta on March 8th, 1919. Open revolt followed this act, but was crushed with barbarous severity by brand, bomb and bullet. Attempts to break up the Wafd organisation failed, and as the country continued to be in a state of unrest and turmoil, the British Government at last conceded a constitution to the Egyptians. The first elections (January, 1924) gave an overwhelming majority to the Zaghlulists.

In recent years the dominating question at issue between the Egyptian native capitalists and the British Government is the control of the Sudan. This huge area of over a million square miles lying south of Egypt, bordering Uganda on the south and Abyssinia on the east, was annexed by the British Government in 1898. Since that date a similar story of capitalistic penetration to that of Egypt has to be recorded. Now Egypt is entirely dependent upon the Nile, and the Sudan controls the Upper Nile. A hostile power in the Sudan, therefore, could easily render Egypt impotent by changing the course of the Nile. Further, the sheep and cattle of the Sudan supply Egypt with much of its food, and the development of cotton production must inevitably react on Egyptian conditions. In addition, future Egyptian industrial progress is dependent upon electricity supplied from Sudanese water power, for Egypt has no coal, and poor oil resources. It will be seen, therefore, that, economically, Egypt and the Sudan are inseparable, and Egyptian capitalist interests are endangered by British control of the Sudan. But the Sudan is of equal importance to British capitalist interests apart from internal economic exploitation, for its coast-

line along the Red Sea forms an important link in Empire communication.

When Zaghlul took office in 1914 he thought that the British Labour Government, then in office, would help the movement for Egyptian Independence, but he was soon to learn that lip opposition to imperialist principles did not imply action along those lines. MacDonald, in fact, told the British High Commissioner in Egypt in a despatch that they (the British Government) "regard their responsibilities as a trust for the Sudan people; there can be no question of their abandoning the Sudan until their work is done"; and in the interview with Zaghlul in London he was very sympathetic with the "sufferings" of the holders of the Turkish Government's bonds, payment on which had been stopped since the War by the Turkish Government. The first British Labour Government also showed its "Labour" principles by condoning domestic slavery in the Sudan. So much for Labour professions!

But if the British Labour Government proved an "eye-opener" to the Egyptian Nationalists, the actions of the latter when in power proved their utter worthlessness so far as the peasants and workers in Egypt were concerned. The whole of the legislation put through by the Zaghlul ministry was favourable to the Egyptian capitalists, and one of its first actions was the replacement of the Militant Trade Unions, which had grown up after the 1919 rising, by organisations controlled by the Wafd, whose members held all the important positions. Strikes were frequent, but these were suppressed by the usual capitalist methods of imprisonment and deportation. It is deserving of notice that at the present time more than one-half of the persons engaged in agriculture are wage workers, and tobacco, silk, railway, constructional and transport workers are organised in Trade Unions.

Recent events in Egypt will doubtless be familiar to our readers. The struggle between the native and British capitalist interests becomes ever more acute. "Crisis" has succeeded "crisis," and on July 19th, 1928, the Egyptian Parliament was suspended for three years and a complete dictatorship has been established, which has prohibited meetings of the Wafd, and exercises a rigid censorship over their press.

Apart from some little glorification of

Communist "leaders," the book is free from the expression of personal opinions. There is much statistical data, and the diction is clear and devoid of literary "frillings." It concludes with the following passage:—

It is evident that no solution of the Egyptian problem has been reached. For imperialism there can be no solution, because the satisfaction of its own needs inevitably fosters the growth of native capitalism, brings into being the working class, robs the Egyptian peasantry of the very means of existence, and thus strengthens the forces which are drawn into the anti-Imperialist struggle.

If, after their previous experiences, the Egyptian workers and peasants are again drawn into this struggle between two sections of their exploiters, they will have themselves to blame, and it should be clear that the workers here have nothing to gain by lending their support to capitalist national movements in any land.

W. J.

ANSWER TO CORRESPONDENT.

THE COMBINES AND THE UNEMPLOYED.

A reader makes the suggestion that the workers should deal at the small shops and avoid the big stores because the growth of the latter stores results in an increase in the army of unemployed. He assumes that the quality and price of the goods sold is the same in both cases. This assumption is in fact not correct. The big stores crush out their small competitors because they can and do undercut them, and offer service which is superior in other respects also. If this were not so the big stores would never be successful in their efforts to crush or absorb the small ones. The workers cannot afford to buy in any but the cheapest market, and the whole idea that they can thus reverse the course of capitalist development is fantastic.

ED. COMM.

MANCHESTER.

A PUBLIC LECTURE

ON

"SOCIALISM"

WILL BE GIVEN IN THE

CO-OPERATIVE HALL, PENDLETON,

Sunday, March 10th, at 7.30 p.m.

Admission Free.

Questions and Discussion.

LABOUR PARTY CONFUSION.

The issue of the "Herald," dated January 14th, tells us that "The Labour Party never for a moment pretended that it was other than a Socialist Party."

Let us then hear the Chairman of that party in his capacity as chairman at the recent Labour Party Conference. There, Mr. George Lansbury said: "In a most important sense Labour was not a class party. It accepted members from all classes, and the objects it sought to attain would benefit men and women of every class." ("Daily Herald," 2/10/28.)

Not being a class party, the Labour Party cannot obviously be a Working Class Party. Such an accommodating party can, therefore, find it easy to secure "rich friends" and finances from the only other section of society, apart from the Working Class—the Capitalists. How promising too, the prospect, that the super-tax payers, the Federation of British Industries, and the mysterious "every class," will, according to Lansbury, all benefit equally. Even to those who possess unlimited trust such prospects will appear too rosy. To those who remember the attitude of the Labour Party towards the Working Class during the war and their readiness to use the armed force against Workers fighting to maintain their poor standard of living during their term of office, Lansbury's statement will appear the merest clap-trap. Now let us sample the Labour Party's "Socialism," from the same source of truth—George Lansbury. In the "Daily Herald" (13/2/28) he said:—

... the country had been obliged to have a little Socialism; infant welfare, maternity centres and State highways were examples of the triumph of Socialism over private enterprise. We could not live without bits of Socialism in our everyday life.

If, as Lansbury maintains, such services are Socialism, then he should surely include such pillars of British progress as our Workhouses, our Prisons and our Lunatic Asylums. In these days of mass output, he should know that it is impossible to leave such "bits of our everyday lives" to private enterprise. We could not tolerate private prisons, private workhouses, could we? We could not!! What Lansbury, in woeful ignorance, or wilful deceit, calls bits of Socialism, are merely state-owned or Government controlled departments of Capitalism. These the capitalists prefer out of the hands of private individuals for their

own economy and convenience. Socialism means common ownership and democratic control of the means of life by the whole of the people. Such common ownership cannot be brought about in bits and pieces by any party or Government; it can only be established as a system of society, when there are a greater number organised for Socialism than there are opposed or apathetic to it. The Labour Party programme shows that they are prepared to take office with non-Socialist support, a fact that falsifies their claim to be a Socialist Party. In a leading article on their election prospects, the "Daily Herald" (14/1/29) said: "At present, the Socialist faith was held only by a minority—an ever-growing minority, but still a minority." The Labour Party must, therefore, if elected without the backing to proceed with Socialist reconstruction, carry on the present system. Be their intentions the most honest, they are powerless to avert or remove the evil the present system begets, notwithstanding the remedies they propose if elected. This has been proved beyond dispute in Labour-governed Australia, and the proof we have given in these columns from time to time. Lansbury's balderdash is a reflection of the confusion that reigns among Labour Party supporters. When they, through education, become Socialist in outlook, they will elect and control Socialist delegates. They will cease to follow leaders with a political Father Christmas stocking containing something for everybody.

MAC.

THE 25th ANNUAL PARTY CONFERENCE

WILL BE HELD ON

Friday and Saturday, March 29th and 30th,

FAIRFAX HALL,

STANHOPE GARDENS, HARRINGAY, N.

Commence at 10 a.m.

Open to All.

THE ANNUAL PARTY RE-UNION will take place in the above Hall on Good Friday, March 29th, at 7.30 p.m. Doors open 7 p.m. Tickets from any Branch Secretary, or Head Office

DISCUSSION CLASSES

The Tooting Branch are holding Discussion Classes at the Adult School, Garratt Lane, Near Tooting Broadway, commencing February 18th, 1929. Open to the Public.

THE INDUSTRIAL TRANSFER FARCE.

Everyone has heard with wearisome repetition that the unemployed miners are destitute. Huge posters have told us so. The Prince of Wales has been put forward to tell us what the master class already knew, that the conditions in the mining areas are "positively ghastly." And the remedy? A little charity! Few ask what was the cause of the misery and poverty so plentiful among the miners when they were employed; when they, like the rest of the working class, were busy piling up wealth for their non-working masters. In such a situation charity is an insult, but as if to add comedy to it the capitalists have produced a scheme from what is termed an "Industrial Transfer Board."

According to a report ("Listener," 16/1/29) "The aim of the scheme is to recruit labour for the prosperous towns." Of course, it does not say where these prosperous towns are. Statistics of unemployment indicate that for the workers such towns are non-existent. As evidence of the condition of places not entirely industrial, note this: "The Mayor of Southend has refused to appeal to the town for the Miners Relief Fund as the distress in Southend is too great" ("East London Advertiser," 19/1/29). There is an object in harping on the distress of particular sections of the working class at particular times. The sorry plight of others is calculated to make the rest of the workers less conscious of their own suffering by making it appear insignificant by contrast. It may be argued that the coal industry is exceptional, but neither coal, boots, food, houses, nor anything else, will be produced if such production is not first profitable to the capitalists who own the means by which the workers could produce them. Houses surely are needed, yet "Comparatively few people realise that among the industries which at present contribute most heavily to swell the total of the unemployed is the building trade." ("New Statesman," 16/2/29.) To advise miners, or any other unemployed men, to take work in the "prosperous towns," is akin to the advice attributed to Marie Antoinette, who, on being told that the French poor were without bread, replied, "Then why do they not eat cake?"

MAC.

OFFICIAL NOTICE.

All communications for the Executive Committee, Subscriptions for the **SOCIALIST STANDARD**, Articles, and Correspondence submitted for insertion therein, should be addressed—The Socialist Party of Great Britain, 17, Mount Pleasant, London, W.C.1, to whom Money Orders should be made payable. The meetings of the Executive Committee are held at the Head Office, every Tuesday, at 7.30 p.m.

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTIONS.

Twelve Months, post free.. .. 2s. 6d.
Six Months, post free 1s. 8d.

The Socialist Standard,

MARCH,



1929

**CAPITALISM
AND CHRISTIANITY.
THE TRUTHS OF QUAKERISM.**

When the Socialist points to the continual struggle between employers and workers, and to the accompanying strife and ill-will as evils which are inseparable from a social system in which property is owned by one class and wealth is produced by another, he is often met with the answer that the discord, the strikes and lock-outs, are the result not of the economic organisation, but of the defects of the human beings concerned.

Thus the Christian will tell us that if only we would all show a spirit of brotherhood, the spirit of Christ, and exercise forbearance, and be unselfish, all our industrial troubles would vanish. For the most part employers and workers, even those who are nominally Christian, make no special effort to apply their Christian principles to their relationships with each other. If a certain trade union appoints an official chaplain, and if other unions habitually open their meetings with prayer, most of the people concerned do not treat these conventional practices as having any useful bearing on the business of the organisation. There are, however, religious persons—the Quakers, for example—who do profess that their religion can and does have a very intimate bearing on their everyday activities, including the running of a business. Thus the Cadbury family claim that the applica-

tion of Quaker principles to industry has made Bournville something of a model for the industrial world, containing the hope of a solution for the problems of modern industry.

We have always contested that view. Bournville embodies no feature which is essentially Quaker; it solves no problems except certain problems of the Cadburys as employers of labour; and it offers no hope for the working class. The idea that the granting of certain health-promoting facilities to the staff brings a return in the shape of greater productivity which exceeds the outlay is not new, and is not confined to Quakers. Nor is the practice of paying wages above the average to a picked staff of more than average skill and fitness. Its motive in general is the securing of greater profits. Its application comes from a more than usually acute perception of the conditions of capitalist production. It is limited in scope by the nature of the work performed in the particular concern, and it is obviously only of special service to the Fords and Cadburys so long as it has not been applied throughout industry. If all employers were to bid against each other for the pick of the workers it would cease to be any more profitable than paying a lower wage for workers of average efficiency, and if all employers offer the same facilities to their staff, each particular firm loses the advantage it formerly obtained in having employees who would remain in the same employment for a long period, thus eliminating the cost of training new employees.

The question has been raised in an acute form by the application of "rationalisation" to the Cadbury cocoa business, the subject of an article in the "New Leader" (Feb. 22) by a Quaker member of the I.L.P., Mr. W. J. Chamberlain. Mr. Chamberlain, it may be added, is editor of a Labour journal, the Birmingham "Town Crier," and has been an active member of the I.L.P. for many years.

He confirms our view that the Cadbury welfare schemes have been a very successful form of advertising, and in this respect alone have been worth many thousands of pounds to the firm in creating a demand for their goods. Now, however, with the application of new methods and the installation of new machinery,

Many hundreds of men and women have been sacked by the firm during the past twelve

months—men and women who have spent the best years of their life in the service of the firm.

Three weeks ago, he says, there were distressing scenes when another 400 women, some of them over 40 years of age, who had been with the firm since early girlhood, were added to Birmingham's 30,000 unemployed. They have little chance of finding fresh employment, and their specialised skill is useless outside the chocolate and cocoa industry. The firm "admitted that there has been no falling off in trade," but the dismissals were necessary "in order to reduce the staff to an economic level." Mr. Chamberlain denies that the grant of a few pounds to some of the dismissed can be regarded as generous treatment to men and women who have given a life of service. Mr. Chamberlain concludes that "even Quakers cannot combine Christianity with capitalism," and that this "is the greatest indictment of Capitalism that we have had in our time." No doubt Mr. Chamberlain would define "Christianity" differently from us, but the first of these two statements appears to be the reverse of true. Surely the truth is that the Cadburys have combined Christianity and Capitalism very successfully indeed. They have made very large profits—the proof of success in a capitalist world—and at the same time they have succeeded in earning and retaining a reputation for Christian principle and brotherliness which has been so effective that among its numerous devotees was to be numbered Mr. W. J. Chamberlain.

"I confess," says Mr. Chamberlain, "that as members of the Society of Friends, I had hoped for great things from Quaker employers. I had hoped that they might have given a bold lead to other employers. But with the action of the Cadbury family my hope has vanished."

One striking thing about the article is the extraordinary lack of knowledge and thought it indicates in its author. Mr. Chamberlain knew that of the directors of Cadbury's all but one "are Liberals or Tories, and therefore upholders of capitalism." He has been in the I.L.P. since 1904. That is to say he has been engaged in preaching to others that (in the words of the I.L.P. slogan) "Socialism is the only hope." Yet for all these years he has retained a belief that far from Socialism being the only hope, there was a much easier and nearer one, i.e., the application of Quaker principles by Quaker capitalists

to capitalist industry. Not until 25 years have passed does he discover that "my hope has vanished, and I know now that we shall have to wait for a Socialist Government to rescue for the workers not benevolence, but justice."

It has taken twenty-five years for an I.L.P. speaker and writer to learn that capitalism is a system of society organised not for the satisfaction of human needs directly, but in the first place for profit-making.

When next members of the I.L.P. tell us that it is useless preaching "pure" Socialist doctrine to the poor, benighted workers because they don't understand, we shall be tempted to reply that the really big problem before the Socialist propagandist is the conversion of the leading lights of the I.L.P.

WAGES AND NATIONALISATION.

Mr. Cramp, Industrial General Secretary of the National Union of Railwaymen, giving evidence before the Royal Commission on Transport, was asked by Major I. Salmon, M.P., whether nationalisation of the railways would lead to higher wages for the railwaymen. Mr. Cramp, who was there as an advocate of railway nationalisation, replied "Certainly not." ("Daily Telegraph," 17/1/29.)

The correspondents of "The Times" and "Morning Post" also record that Mr. Cramp replied in the negative to this question, but curiously enough, the "Daily Herald" correspondent, although his report is much longer, appears not to have noticed either the question or the answer.

From the railway workers' point of view, all that Mr. Cramp hopes for as a result of nationalisation, is an "improvement in status" (whatever that may mean) and "conceivably" an "improvement" in conditions which would "probably" take the form of "a better system of superannuation." ("Daily Herald," 17/1/29.)

The Socialist Party bases its attitude of deliberate and permanent hostility to nationalisation on the ground that nationalisation is a question affecting capitalist interests only, of no real advantage to the working class and possessing certain material disadvantages. It would be interesting to learn from Mr. Cramp and his fellow supporters of nationalisation in the Labour Party and Communist Party, why they continue to advocate it.

H.

THE SOCIALIST OUTLOOK.

The Socialist's view of life is essentially historical. That is to say, he takes the widest possible view of human experience, seeing in the past the raw material which the present is constantly converting into the future.

Old facts and new facts alike provide food for his mind, and having inwardly digested them, he reviews ideas, both new and old, in the light of the knowledge so obtained. In all this he follows the scientific method.

The stage of social life is his laboratory. By abstract analysis he discovers the inner forces of that life and, having traced their laws, he comprehends the play; but he is not an inactive spectator merely. He is also one of the players, and his understanding is necessary to the effective performance of his part.

For the drama of human development has reached a crisis. Men and women are about to become the masters of things which have used them hitherto as puppets. "From slavery to freedom" is the battle cry taken up by an ever-increasing number of the players.

What is this slavery? And what, this freedom? For ages the primary and fundamental activity of mankind has been work, work! To win from Nature a firmer footing for the race. To develop the powers slumbering in human nerve and sinew. To construct an artificial substitute for the crude, merciless, "God-given" arena of savage strife.

Few have lived to enjoy the fruits of their toil. Fewer still have managed to live upon the toil of others. The many have toiled under varying conditions, that these few, the brave, the powerful and the crafty should fight and govern and scheme to enjoy the wealth and leisure so created. For who, given the choice, would prefer toil to the life of ease?

The whip of the slave-driver, the sword of the baron, and the menace of hunger. These have been, and are, the weapons which have flogged, prodded and terrified men and women to their daily task; and, as each weapon has given way in turn to a more effective one, so the productivity of toil has grown till even the most gigantic scheme of waste cannot rid the markets of the wares which glut them. So numbers now know idleness, indeed, but starve!

They may not work! Refinement of slavery—even the slave's first need is denied them. They must not feed and clothe and house themselves, for much of the food, clothing and housing in existence cannot be sold!

Money, devised to circulate commodities, gravitates in narrowing circles and decrees stagnation. Choked with wealth, the masters condemn their slaves to poverty.

"Enough! Cease toil!"

"Cease toil?" the workers cry. "Is this some sudden freak, or mockery of Fate, that, not having won the ease for which we strive, we yield its only pledge?" And yet there is no cloud but has its lining of shining silver. Let but the toilers turn the cloud of oppression about and they will see the answer to their riddle.

Mankind has won the age-long battle with external Nature. Security for all is ours for the taking. There, in the idle factories, pits and deserted fields lie the means to feed and clothe and house the human race. Here are our hands, brains and muscles ready, willing and eager for the task.

What holds them back? The Law!

Framed through centuries by the rich and mighty, by the aid of their hirelings to fetter the creative giant.

Yet even the guns which thunder at their bidding, the swords they rattle, the latest fiend's device of prostituted science, they, too, are the products of our toil. What we produce shall we not control? Do we lack the will to struggle and endure till victory be ours, who all our lives have known nought else but ceaseless struggle and grim endurance with empty pockets for our pains? E. B.

LECTURES

CAMBERWELL BRANCH.

Trades Council Room, 6a, Artichoke Place, Camberwell Green.

March 1st, 8.30 p.m.

"DO RATES AND TAXES CONCERN THE WORKING CLASS."

Speaker, W. E. McHAFFIE.

March 15th, 8.30 p.m.,

"SOCIALISM AND THE MODERN UTOPIANS."

Speaker, E. LAKE.

FREE.—Questions and Discussion.

SOCIALIST BREVITIES.

HEY PRESTO!

Merlin and Cagliostro were reputed to be the thing in wizards in their day. Of recent years the Welsh Wizard has eclipsed their old-time wonders. Ninepence for fourpence, for instance. But ninepence! What would you say to 2,666.6 ninepences for fourpence? Or, in good English, one hundred jimmy o' goblins for fourpence! Not done, you say? Oh, well, you don't read your newspapers. Besides, you do not realise the miraculous nature of the capitalist system. Read, mark, luke—I mean learn—etc., the following instance of modern necromancy as reported in the *Daily News*, 25.1.29:—

£100 for 4d.

In the early stages of the Ner-Sag meeting, when the first revelations were made, but before they reached the Stock Exchange, a man rushed from the meeting to telephone his stockbroker (writes a City correspondent).

He told them to sell 500 Ner-Sag shares which he did not possess. He sold at 17s. per share. He telephoned his brokers in the afternoon and told them to buy back the 500 shares to cover his bargain. He bought them back at 12/6 each.

On February 7, the next Stock Exchange Pay Day, his brokers will pay him a little over £100.

All that this "bear" operation will have cost him is 4d. for two telephone calls.

No wands, no incantations, no stinks, no ritual of any sort! All done by kindness. A wonderful system, capitalism!

* * *

STRANGE BEDFELLOWS.

Wages seem to have got so high lately that they must soon be out of reach altogether. They are, of course, for some million and a half workers now. Yes, these "excessive" wages are an awful curse! This does not apply, however, to the "wages of superintendence," or whatever the "economists" might call the "bunce" pouched by the non-workers.

There should be a law to stop paying wages altogether and let the workers eat one another. This would keep down the "surplus" population, I have little doubt. If you read the paragraph below, taken from the *Daily Herald* for 7.2.29, you will readily see that a substantial decrease in the wages of the worker would ease some of the unrest and discontent of the capitalists from which industry is suffering so acutely at the present time:—

BANKER WANTS WAGES CUT.

But his Dividend is 18 per cent.

Mr. Henry Allan, chairman of the Clydesdale

Bank, moved at the annual meeting at Glasgow, yesterday, that the dividend on Ordinary shares should be 18 per cent., and then proceeded to complain of what he himself called high wages.

Business conditions during the past year, said Mr. Allan, were disappointing. The unemployment figures showed a large increase. Unfortunately the remedy was very difficult. In the outstanding case of the railwaymen, high wages were actually fortified by Act of Parliament.

The evil of excessive wages was aggravated by the general fall in prices which followed the return of the gold standard. Prices had fallen about 15 per cent. since 1924, without any corresponding reduction in wages.

The 18 per cent. dividend was adopted.

Now, boys, let us all pull together and try to make that 18 per cent. into 1,800 per cent.!

* * *

THOSE PAMPERED WORKERS.

East is East and West is West

And ne'er the twain shall meet-O!

Left is Left and Right is Right

(With knobs), ditto repeato!

Anon.

What philosophical depths are plumbed by these lines! What fecundity of thought! But lately I have been assailed by doubts as to whether they apply always and without exceptions. "Liberalism," for instance, whatever else it may be, I am told, is "Liberalism."

Similarly, I suppose, "Labour" is "Labour," and that might or might not explain anything or nothing, whichever may be chosen. But that Labour stalwart, J. A. Hobson, has been contending recently that there is no real difference between the aims and policies of the Liberal and the "Labour" Parties!

In an article in the *Manchester Guardian* (8.2.29) entitled "Liberalism and Labour," he advocates co-operation between the two parties on the grounds that the Liberal programme "presents a sufficient body of agreement with the adopted policy of the Labour Party to warrant thoughtful members of that party in looking favourably on co-operation."

So, it would appear that although Mr. Hobson belongs to the Labour Party, "Hobson's Choice" is not too well grounded. H. N. Brailsford and others agree with Hobson.

Now read the following extract from the article referred to:—

The declaration of Labour in favour of "public ownership" of foundation industries, such as land, railroads, power, and banking, may seem at first sight a fatal obstacle to co-operation.

But is there much substance in it? Labour does not propose to confiscate these undertakings. Its nationalisation would have to be financed by public bond issues, which for the most part would be taken in exchange for the existing share and debenture capital of the concern so "nationalised."

Fixed interest would still be paid to the persons who had invested their capital in these undertakings. Would this differ appreciably from the Liberal proposal to leave the ownership of the undertakings intact, but to put them on a fixed interest or debenture basis?

Having now learnt what "Socialism" is, I invite you to read what the *Morning Post*, in an editorial (11.2.29) has to say about this conception of Socialism—

They (the Labour Party) have said a thousand times: "We do not believe in your 'capitalist' system"; yet they now propose to administer that "system," and better, apparently, than those who do believe in it.

We can understand the logic and appreciate the honesty of Socialists who seek office in order to establish Socialism; but we cannot understand the mental or moral position of Socialists who propose to take office in order to continue Capitalism. And we suggest to our readers to put these simple tests to the professions and promises of our Socialist leaders. Do they propose to put Socialism in practice? If they do, do we want Socialism? If they do not, then why should we want them?

Isn't this too cruel to the Labour Party! To be bombarded with the same ammunition by both the *Morning Post* and the *SOCIALIST STANDARD*! No, I can't believe those lines now!

* * *

OUT OF THEIR OWN MOUTHS.

On page 3 of the circular issued by the Labour Press Service great prominence is given to a statement regarding Unemployment Benefit (February 13th):—

THE HONEST UNEMPLOYED GET LESS CONSIDERATION FROM THE GOVERNMENT THAN CONVICTS DO.

The Government pays:—

£1 9s. 5d. a week to keep a convict in a Convict Prison.

£2 4s. 5d. a week to keep a convict in a Preventive Detention Prison.

£1 6s. 9d. to keep an offender in a Borstal Institution.

But it only pays—

17s. a week Unemployment Benefit to keep an honest workman who has the misfortune to be unemployed.

The Labour Party has repeatedly asked the Government to increase the amount of benefit for the unemployed.

The Government has refused all these requests, and has actually reduced the benefit of many of the unemployed instead of increasing it.

Then on page 4 we are informed how a

Labour Government will tackle the unemployment "problem":—

Proper maintenance for the unemployed until re-absorbed.

Until they are re-absorbed into industry, a Labour Government would see that the unemployed are treated more humanely than at present. It would increase Unemployment Benefits to 20s. for men over 18, and 18s. for women over 18; it would raise the allowance for a wife or housekeeper to 10s. weekly, and the allowance per child from 2s. to 5s.; and it would make similar increases in the benefits of young workers.

At the same time, by the discouragement of luxury spending and the direct increase of purchasing power in the hands of the workers, through better provision against unemployment, sickness, invalidity and old age, a Labour Government would increase the demand for staple commodities and powerfully assist the restoration of the chief industries of the country.

In other words, until the unemployed are re-absorbed into industry the Labour Government will pay to a man over 18 9s. 5d. a week less than it costs to keep a convict in a Convict Prison, £1 4s. 5d. a week less than it costs to keep a convict in a Preventive Detention Prison, 6s. 9d. a week less than it costs to keep an offender in a Borstal Institution.

Note how the Labour Government would "powerfully assist" the restoration of the chief industries of the country by disorganising some of the "chief industries" of the country—the "luxury trades."

Providence, presumably, will be left the task of re-absorbing the workers in the luxury trades who would be thrown out of work by the application of the suggested remedy.

SARCASTIGATOR.

PAMPHLETS FOR SALE.

We have had a big demand for the pamphlets published by the Socialist Party of Canada, and the following can still be supplied—

"Wage-Labour and Capital" (Marx), 60 pages, 4d.

"Communist Manifesto" (Marx and Engels), 59 pages, 4d.

"Causes of Belief in God" (Lafargue), 48 pages, 6d.

"Socialism—Utopian and Scientific" (Engels), 95 pages, 6d.

"Value, Price and Profit" (Marx), 78 pages, 6d.

Note.—Postage extra; ½d. per copy.

THE SOCIALIST MESSAGE.

A General Election is coming and all parties are using their resources to the utmost in the effort to persuade the workers that one or other of the programmes put forward will meet the difficulties that face the workers to-day. These difficulties are not new; they are simply intensified as time goes on.

Leading advocates of the two older parties, Liberal and Tory, admit the difficulties, but claim that they are an inevitable and unalterable consequence of civilised society. For this reason these two parties seek only to remedy the most glaring evils whilst leaving unaltered the present basis of society. Each of the two parties have had turn and turn about in supreme control of social affairs in this country, and each in turn has failed to develop any line of attack that made, or would make, any appreciable difference in the poverty, unemployment, and general insecurity and misery of the workers' lot.

The Labour Party, now the Opposition in Parliament, plead for time to carry out their ever-lengthening list of reforms. Their leading advocates claim that they are eminently practical people and repudiate the charge that they aim at revolutionising the basis of society. Their conduct, during the short period of Labour Government gave a clear indication of their intention to follow in the footsteps of the two older parties where matters affecting the basic organisation of society were concerned.

An examination of the programme of any one of these three parties leaves the worker bewildered with the mass of intricate matter concerning taxation, banking, etc., of which he must acquire an accurate knowledge if he wishes to correctly estimate the more or less usefulness of one programme against another, unless he is prepared to take one or the other at its own valuation. And yet the position is a relatively simple one when not deliberately overloaded with useless and cunning statements and arguments.

Wealth (food, clothing, and so forth) is produced as a result of the application of human energy to natural resources in one form or another. To produce this wealth, the means of production (land, machinery, and the like) and human energy are needed. At present the employers as a class own the means of production, and the workers

as a class supply the human energy, mental and manual.

In return for their labour the workers receive, at the best of times, little more than represents the food, clothing and so forth necessary to keep them in fit condition to go on working and bring up a family to replace them in the workshops. At the worst of times, the wage is inadequate for even the bare needs of life, as the condition of large masses of workers have given pitiful testimony; for instance, the position of large sections of land-workers at different times and the present position of the coal miners.

The land the workers work upon, the machinery they use, and the articles they make do not belong to the workers, but belong to the employers who pay the wages. The difference between the value of the wealth the workers produce and the value of the wages they receive back in payment for their work represents a surplus of wealth which enables the employers, who take it, to live without working.

Broadly speaking, the whole of society is made up of the two classes—Employers and Workers. The worker, on the average, owns nothing but his power to work; the employer owns everything. When a worker sells his working power to an employer he is in effect selling himself, as he must work on the conditions laid down by the employer or lose his employment. Without employment the worker, with few exceptions, is without the means of living and must die of starvation or allow himself to be put in jail under some pretext. However thinly it may be disguised, the ultimatum the employing class present to the working class to-day is "Work under the conditions we lay down or die." The workers are therefore slaves. They are slaves to the employing class who determine how, where, and why they shall live.

The object of production to-day is to sell goods for profit so that the employers may have a surplus to take. The markets of the world for the sale of goods are limited. New machinery and improved methods of production fill these markets ever more rapidly as time goes on. When markets are filled production slackens and workers are thrown out of employment. While production is for the market unemployment will continue to grow to even larger dimensions. The million and a half that have been unemployed in this country for years are still

awaiting the constantly promised return of prosperity, which, like the thaw we were waiting for during the recent frosty spell, keeps taking the wrong turning. In spite of this the Blue Train and the First Class Liner still carry their cargoes of people able to enjoy the best of life.

Apart from unemployment, which is the direct outcome of the conditions mentioned above, the employers are interested in always having on hand a large body of unemployed in order to keep down and defeat the workers' demands for an improved standard of living by dangling before individual workers the fact that there are other workers waiting at the factory gate wolfishly waiting to take their jobs. This explains the reason for the regularly organised campaigns to induce the workers to bring into the world large families and the spasmodic interest of the State in child welfare, during these times of widespread unemployment.

To present society the name of "Capitalism" has been given because every complete process of production commences with the investment of capital—wealth invested for the purpose of profit. It has at its root the acceptance of the private ownership of the means of production as the normal and unalterable basis of productive operations. While this condition remains present evils in the mass must continue and flourish. Capitalism, therefore, and all parties that accept its basic condition, has no solution for the workers' troubles. It can only dabble here and there with some of the minor evils.

To the workers who read this article we would address ourselves in a more personal manner.

Are you satisfied to let things go on in the same old way? You are slaves to-day because you allow your masters to own the things you produce and thereby control in the main your lives.

You associate together to produce all things, the good and the bad. Your masters take no part in production, yet they take what you have produced. In return for the labour you spend in the field, the factory and the workshop you receive, at the best of times, only a beggarly pittance that does little more than keep you alive and enable you to bring up children to replace you in slavery. Even when in work you are always watchful lest, through no fault of your own, you lose your job. Out of work,

your lot is miserable indeed—often a more or less rapid journey to the grave through insufficient nourishment. In numbers you are the overwhelming majority of the nation, and yet you hand over to a relatively small group of masters the product of your work.

There is no absolute law of Nature decreeing that one man shall have and another shall not have. The land of this country was never given by Nature, nor by any mysterious power, as a free gift to anyone. Those who hold it to-day inherit what their forerunners had taken. And those who hold the means of producing wealth obtained possession in a like manner though the possession is sanctioned and sanctified by legal forms.

There is no common interest between you and your masters within the present social conditions. It is their interest to extract from you as much wealth as you can produce for the lowest outlay in wages, as by this means they wax wealthy. It is your interest to obtain possession of the means of production with which you produce wealth in order to produce wealth for your own benefit, letting the idler and parasite go to work for his bread.

It is your class who organise the whole of production to-day—those who get a living by selling their mental and manual energies to the capitalist class. It can be organised to-morrow for the equal benefit of all by the same class that organises it to-day—your class.

Do not heed the smooth-tongued orator who would tell you to work in harmony with your masters for your mutual benefit. The capitalist lives by the exploitation of the worker. Between exploiter and exploited there can be no harmony of interest. When exploitation as a system is done away with, then there will be neither exploiter nor exploited.

Between you and the possession of the means of production stand the laws of capitalism, and behind these laws stands the State—the organised oppressive power of the ruling class. Before you can obtain control of the means of production you must, as a first step, capture the State power. This State power is centred in Parliament and the group in a majority in Parliament has the power to control society.

In the evolution of capitalism the capitalist has gradually relinquished one after the other the functions he once performed,

and has therefore been compelled to delegate these functions to officials he pays. Along with this the size and complicated nature of modern society have compelled him to concede to the workers facilities which place within their reach the means of ousting the capitalists from their privileged position if and when the workers wish to do so.

Circumstances therefore compel you, if you wish to get out of slavery, to send delegates to Parliament to capture the control of affairs.

In choosing your delegates, you must remember it is *servants* you want, not masters nor leaders.

The Socialist Party of Great Britain is a political party of working men and women organised together for the purpose of getting control of political power in order to introduce Socialism. Its Parliamentary candidates are selected as fitting tools for the job. Its members control the party throughout and determine, by majority decisions, the policy of the organisation. This policy is set forth in all the literature the party publishes. The party is controlled entirely by its members and is not at the beck and call of either a place-hunting individual or a group of self-seekers.

If you are tired of the chains of slavery, join the party and thereby give us your aid in the work of speeding out of existence the system that oppresses us all.

The earth and its fullness is for no man's private possession. Let the workers of the world determine that it shall be for the equal benefit of all.

GILMAC.

THE "CRUELTY" OF CAPITALISM.

In the February SOCIALIST STANDARD (see page 94, column 2) our contributor, A. Kohn, pointed out that Socialists do not object to capitalism as a "mistake" or a "monstrosity," but "recognise its place in social evolution as a pre-condition for the coming of Socialism." A correspondent, "Humanitas," writes to protest that a system of society which is based on gross inequality of wealth with the resulting "tragic consequences to life" must be regarded as "a mistake and a social monstrosity." "Humanitas" continues as follows:—

Such stark injustice . . . condemns any system, whether it leads to Socialism or any other state. In the name of logic and scientifically-

grounded philosophy how can social injustice and (implicitly) the cruelty that initiated and continues it be justified or excused on any grounds?

In the first place, "Humanitas" has misunderstood our contributor's point. The statement was not a "justification" for capitalism, but a mere statement of fact. It is a fact that capitalism has made Socialism possible, but the Socialist does not "justify" capitalism on that ground. The reason for the existence of capitalism was that it offered the means of bettering the conditions of life of society as a whole. Capitalism is developing in Russia, for instance, because as a literal fact it offers a higher standard of living to the Russian workers and peasants than is, with Russia's low development of industry, obtainable otherwise. To talk about capitalism being "initiated and continued" by "cruelty" is a mere empty phrase. Capitalism was initiated by persons who—both capitalists and wage-earners—stood to gain thereby. It is continued by capitalists and wage-earners in this country because both, the former correctly and the latter incorrectly, think that they still cannot do better than continue it. The Socialist points out that the functions formerly performed by the capitalist class (functions which made it worth while for society to accept the existence of a property-owning class) are no longer performed by them. The capitalist system can now, with advantage to the majority, be dispensed with.

ED. COMM.

Contributions are earnestly invited to assist us with the expense of publishing more literature.

S.P.G.B. PROPAGANDA MEETINGS

LONDON DISTRICT.

- | | |
|----------------------|--|
| Sundays ... | Clapham Common, 3 p.m.
Tottenham, West Green Corner, 11.30 a.m.
Tooting, Garrett Lane, Tooting Broadway, 7.30 p.m.
Victoria Park, 4 p.m.
Woolwich, Beresford Square, 7.30 p.m.
Hyde Park, 11.30 p.m.
Paddington, Prince of Wales, 8 p.m. |
| Mondays ... | Paddington, Prince of Wales, 8 p.m.
Clerkenwell, Gurnault Place, 8 p.m. |
| Wednesdays | Hackney, Paragon Road and Mare Street, 8 p.m.
Paddington, Prince of Wales, 8 p.m. |
| Thursdays ... | Becontree, Rodney Street, Ilford, 8 p.m. |
| Fridays .. | Clerkenwell, Acton, St., Grays Inn Rd, 8 p.m.
West Ham, Water Lane, 8 p.m. |
| Saturdays ... | Wood Green, Jolly Butchers Hill, 8 p.m.
Leyton, Corner Grange Park, 7.30 p.m. |

HANLEY BRANCH.

- | | |
|--------------------|--|
| Sundays ... | Hanley Market Square, 7 p.m.
Burslem, St. John Square, 7 p.m. |
|--------------------|--|

BRANCH DIRECTORY.

- BATTERSEA.**—Sec., 2, Hanbury-road, S.W.11. Branch meets Thursday, 8.30 p.m. at The Waiting Room, Latchmere Baths, entrance in Burns-road. Discussion second Thurs. in month.
- BECONTREE.**—Sec., Hy. Gratton, 4, Drummond Ave., Brooklands, Romford. Branch meets 1st and 3rd Wednesdays at 7.30, at above address.
- BIRMINGHAM.**—Sec. E. Jesper, 88, Rollason-rd., Erdington. Branch meets The Continental Café, Moor St., 1st and 3rd Sundays at 11 a.m.
- CAMBERWELL.**—Branch meets at Camberwell Trades Council Room, 6A, Artichoke Place, Camberwell Green, every Friday at 8.30 p.m. Discussions—public invited. Letters to Secretary at above address.
- CENTRAL.**—Membership obtained only through the Ex. Committee. Applications to General Sec.
- CLERKENWELL.**—Branch meets Wednesdays, 8 p.m., at 17, Mount Pleasant, W.C.1. Discussions first Wednesday in month at 8 p.m.—all invited. Sec., at above address.
- EAST LONDON.**—Sec., D. Jacobs, 28, Lyal Road, Bow, E.3. Branch meets 1st and 3rd Mondays at 8 p.m. at Stewart's Cafe, 195, Cambridge Rd., E.2.
- GLASGOW.**—Sec. W. Falconer, 128, Bluevale Street.
- HACKNEY.**—Branch meets The Old Gravel Pit Hall, Mare-street, Hackney, Mondays, 8 p.m., Discussions 9.30. Communication to Sec. as above.
- HANLEY.**—Branch meets Tuesdays, Working Men's Club, Glass-st. Sec., F. Goldstraw, 38, Paddock Street, Hanley.
- ISLINGTON.**—Branch meets Wednesdays, 8.30, at 144, Seven Sister-rd., Holloway, N. Sec., A. Gregory, 24, Goodinge Rd., N.7.
- LEYTON.**—Sec., A. Holland, 396, Lea Bridge-rd., Leyton. Branch meets 8 p.m., Trades and Labour Hall, Grove House, High-rd., second Mondays in month.
- MANCHESTER.**—Sec., W. Addison, 111, West Park-street, Salford, Manchester.—Branch meets 1st and 3rd Thursdays in month, 7.45 p.m. at 114, Duke St., Stretford-road.
- PADDINGTON.**—Branch meeting held on 2nd and 4th Fridays, 8 p.m., in room above the Co-operative Stores, 306, Kilburn-lane, W.9 (side door).
- SOUTHEND-ON-SEA.**—Sec., J. Bird, 5 Welling-ton-avenue, Westcliffe-on-Sea.
- TOOTING.**—Sec., 15, University-road, Collier's Wood, S.W. 19. Branch meets every Friday at 8 p.m. at Tooting Adult School, 971, Garratt-lane, S.W. 17.
- TOTTENHAM.**—Secretary, 18, Woodlands Park Rd., N.15. Branch meets Fridays, Room 2, Trade Hall, 7, Bruce Grove. Discussion after branch business. Public invited.
- WALTHAMSTOW.**—Sec., S. E. Williams, 3, Dyson-rd., Leytonstone, E.11. Branch meets at Workmen's Hall, High-st., every Monday.
- WATFORD.**—A. Lawson, Sec., 107 Kensington-avenue, Watford. Branch meets Mondays at 8.30 p.m. at Secretary's address.

- WEST HAM.**—Branch meets Thursdays at 8 p.m. at 167 Romford rd., Stratford. Sec., P. Hallard, 22, Colegrave-rd., Stratford, E.
- WOOD GREEN.**—All communications to Sec., F. W. Godfrey, 71, Falkland Road, N.8.
- WOOLWICH.**—Branch meets at 94, Griffin Road, Plumstead. Communications to Secretary at above address.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY

OF GREAT BRITAIN.

OBJECT.—The establishment of a system of society based upon the common ownership and democratic control of the means and instruments for producing and distributing wealth by and in the interests of the whole community.

DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain

HOLDS—

That society as at present constituted is based upon the ownership of the means of living (i.e., land, factories, railways, etc.) by the capitalist or master class, and the consequent enslavement of the working class by whose labour alone wealth is produced.

That in society, therefore, there is an antagonism of interests, manifesting itself as a class struggle, between those who possess but do not produce and those who produce but do not possess.

That this antagonism can be abolished only by the emancipation of the working class from the domination of the master class, by the conversion into the common property of society of the means of production and distribution, and their democratic control by the whole people.

That as in the order of social evolution the working class is the last class to achieve its freedom, the emancipation of the working class will involve the emancipation of all mankind, without distinction of race or sex.

That this emancipation must be the work of the working class itself.

That as the machinery of government, including the armed forces of the nation, exists only to conserve the monopoly by the capitalist class of the wealth taken from the workers, the working class must organise consciously and politically for the conquest of the powers of government, national and local, in order that this machinery, including these forces, may be converted from an instrument of oppression into the agent of emancipation and the overthrow of privilege, aristocratic and plutocratic.

That as political parties are but the expression of class interests, and as the interest of the working class is diametrically opposed to the interests of all sections of the master class, the party seeking working-class emancipation must be hostile to every other party.

The SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain, therefore, enters the field of political action determined to wage war against all other political parties, whether alleged labour or avowedly capitalist, and calls upon the members of the working class of this country to muster under its banner to the end that a speedy termination may be wrought to the system which deprives them of the fruits of their labour, and that poverty may give place to comfort, privilege to equality, and slavery to freedom.

Those agreeing with the above principles and desiring enrolment in the Party should apply for membership form to secretary of nearest branch or at Head Office.

THE Socialist Standard

The Official Organ of **THE SOCIALIST PARTY** of Great Britain.

No. 296. Vol. 25.]

LONDON, APRIL, 1929.

[MONTHLY, TWOPENCE.]

WHAT TO DO WITH YOUR VOTE.

In a few short weeks you will again be invited to attend at various schoolrooms and public buildings labelled: "Polling Booth," and there inscribe against the name of some individual or other a little cross. Quite a simple little process, and one which, in our dull world, becomes every now and then invested with an air of excitement and festivity. Some of you will be voting for the first time in your lives, most will have voted at several previous elections. The great majority will feel that the occasion is such a rare one, and the excitement so general, they must, if only from a sense of duty, affix their little cross upon the ballot paper. There will be no lack of advisers. The hoardings will groan beneath ten-foot posters calling your attention to the enormous achievements of the party whose power is expiring, and, in contrast, to the millennium about to dawn if you vote for the other side this time. Each side—so called—will call your attention to the shocking lies now being disseminated by the other. Each will tell you that a vote for the other is a vote for catastrophe. Little windows in shabby streets will break out in a rash of cards, begging the passer-by to "Vote for Spoofem," or some other. Halls and schoolrooms will be hired, street corners and market places annexed, whereat hoarse and fervent orators will pour forth tales of their opponents' rascality and the stained-glass, saintly purity of themselves. The newspapers and the Press generally will join in the national fever, and, if report be true, the ether will be exploited by means of the radio. Leather-lunged loud-speakers are to squawk their message from touring vans, and altogether we are in for a hell of a time.

In the face of all this racket and excitement, to ask you to make no use of your

vote seems rather feeble, doesn't it? In point of fact, we do not ask you to do anything. When you try and quietly figure it all out, the feebleness lies in a rather different direction.

In the first place, why all this pother, why this hectic atmosphere, why these repeated emphatic appeals for your vote? Very briefly, it is because they want to GOVERN you. There is a tremendous emphasis on that word "govern." Familiarity has dulled appreciation of its essential meaning to most people, but it is worth pausing just there, and saying the word "govern" over and over again to yourself until it takes on a little flavour of strangeness, and you try and realise what government means. Time was when people were not asked to vote for government. They got it, hard and heavy, and they knew it. And when it hurt too much, rebellion was born, and riot, insurrection and discontent. Now, after generations of struggle, you have gained the right of being asked whom you wish to govern you. But notice, in particular, you are still to be governed. Even the Labour Party promises you a Labour Government. Now, if you still retain enough of the flavour of strangeness about that common word, government, you should ask yourself, "Who are the governors, pray, and who the governed?" and "Why Government at all?" A critical survey of the world around you should supply you with the answer. The governors are the rich, those who hold the keys to our means of life. The governed are the poor, those who have to hire themselves for wages to the rich and powerful. The rich govern the poor, that is, they keep you in order and stamp upon any sign of revolt or discontent. But they are relatively few in number, and by long experience they

have found that the way of retaining their power to govern you is by getting your assent to its continuance. So they arrange themselves into two or three groups, whose opinions differ upon trifling administrative details, and represent themselves to you as dire and bitter antagonists and ask you to choose one or the other for master. Now, in theory, this is a dangerous proceeding, for you might see through the trick and say "A plague on all your houses." In practice, it has worked out very satisfactorily for the rich, for as they own the Press, the Pulpit, the Schools, the Broadcasting service, and your means of livelihood, any alternative opinion is heavily handicapped. But in spite of all, no monopoly can be complete, or eternal. The little sheet you are now reading is a proof of that.

The system in which a small rich class own the means whereby all live, and a large class have to hire themselves for wages in order to live, is called Capitalism. It is the system in which we are living to-day. The Socialist Party of Great Britain suggests as an alternative that the means of living should be taken away from the small parasitic class at present owning them, and commonly owned and administered by the whole people. That alternative is called Socialism. You will be asked some day to vote for the one or the other. That question will not be asked you at the next General Election. What you will be asked is: "Do you still want to be governed; do you still believe in Capitalism?" If you do, it will not matter to Capitalism whether you put your little cross against the Conservative, the Liberal, or the Labour candidate. They will have secured your voluntary assent to the continuance of Capitalism, and your willing acceptance of the fact of being governed. That is all that matters to them. If, where a Socialist candidate is not running, you write the word "Socialism" across your ballot paper, your vote is spoiled. True, but at any rate you have not signified that you are a willing supporter of Capitalism. The best thing, of course, is to join the Socialist Party and see that at the next General Election there is no need to spoil any ballot paper.

W. T. H.

NEW PREMISES.

It has now been arranged that we shall enter our new premises about the middle of May—42, GREAT DOVER STREET, S.E.1., close to Borough Station (Underground).

A "SIMPLE" CURE FOR INDUSTRIAL TROUBLE.

The *Daily News* of Wednesday, February 27th, 1929, reports: "That the General Council of the Trade Union Congress considered the draft interim report on Unemployment which has been prepared by the Mond-Turner Conference."

The report was adopted with a few modifications. The news goes on to say: "That the report deals with more or less palliative measures for unemployment and that more preventive measures will be covered in the final report, assuming that the Conference continues its work. It discusses the practicability of the Organisation of National Works to supplement measures, such as credit facilities, to foster a general revival in trade." The question on providing pensions at 65 was also discussed.

This appeared on page 9. On page 11 we find another report. It is headed, Psychology Removes Worries in British Workshops. Six Girls Now Do the Work of 120. Increased Output and Greater Economy.

The report is a long one, but the following extracts will suffice:—

"The phenomenal labour saving referred to above was achieved in the design and equipment of a new safety glass works. Radical changes have been achieved in production methods and labour-saving devices have been introduced which have led to a marked reduction of manufacturing costs. Thus in the case of two connected operations six girls will now do the work which formerly required 120. Waste of material has been reduced from 18 to 5 per cent. and the new factory will be able to produce in one shift almost double the output originally specified. The scope of the National Institutes of Industrial Psychology includes, the layout of factories, the sequence of processes, the elimination of waste of effort, material, and time in production, the selection of appropriate employees, and, lastly, the greater efficiency and contentment of the employees by improved working conditions." The report finishes by quoting the World's Economic Conference's opinion: "That the workers should be safeguarded from temporary unemployment, resulting from this rationalisation, otherwise the movement will encounter the same opposition as befell the first at-

tempt to introduce Taylor's system of scientific management."

Viewing these reports together, the thing that suggests itself is the fact that here we have two organisations, both claiming to strive for the good of the workers and yet one nullifies the effects of the other. The trade unions struggle for shorter hours and more pay and confer with the masters in an endeavour to foster trade to bring about more employment and when they have succeeded the masters employ psychologists to find out how they can do without a great percentage of the workers, leaving those still in employment more efficient, turning out as much if not more work with less waste and yet being contented with their job, keeping at bay those elements of industrial unrest which are so disturbing to the capitalist. Thus the trade unions find themselves precisely where they were, but with probably a bigger army of unemployed to deal with. Being Socialists, we realise that psychology when used simply for the benefit of mankind can be a great aid to human happiness, but in the hands of the masters, being used as a means to further exploitation, it becomes yet another burden upon the backs of the workers. The watchword of industry to-day is produce more, yet all the time the competition for the world's markets is becoming more fierce and the markets more limited, making the disposal of the commodities less and less certain with the result that the unemployment figures increase and the different countries, in spite of peace pacts, etc., are heading straight for war. It is a time for serious reflection, fellow-workers. Do you not find all these social remedies simply cancel each other? It is a ceaseless following of blind alleyways in which the workers get bewildered and hopeless. Unless they understand the Socialist position, they are tempted to make useless angry demonstrations and riots which can only result in loss of life or injury to our class and give the Government a chance to demonstrate their power and make an example of a few of the workers. There is only one sound policy to pursue, and that is the constant preaching of Socialism. When we have sufficient knowledge as a class, we can obtain political power. Remembering that the salvation of the workers must be the work of the workers, we must neither put our faith in the Lord,

nor leaders, nor psychologists. Given the knowledge, the rest, by comparison, will be simplicity itself. Join the S.P.G.B., fellow-wage slaves, and help to spread that knowledge that Socialism may come in our time, and we enjoy the fruits of our labour.

M. OTWAY.

AN ECHO OF THE PAST.

"A denouncement of young women authors who write obscene books was made by Miss Christabel Pankhurst in a speech at the Æolian Hall, Bond Street, yesterday. She said that pagan novels were much in evidence to-day, and she was grateful to the Home Secretary for the step he had taken regarding books which were not decent to read. This is not the sort of freedom for which we women fought and got the vote" (*Daily Chronicle*, March 7th). We do not know by what standard Miss Christabel Pankhurst judges what is decent to read, nor do we remember any special protest being made during the war by either Miss Pankhurst or the present Home Secretary when reams of literature with plentiful detail of war-time atrocities were circulated among young people in order to fan the war fever. We gave it as our opinion at the time that under normal conditions such material would probably meet with the attention of the police. Evidently what is necessary to our masters at one time shocks them at another. In view of the recent extension of the franchise to women it may be interesting to recall that the "freedom" the Suffragettes fought for was only the freedom which would enable Capitalist ladies to vote on equal terms with their property-owning males. Before the Suffragette movement the Working Class had sufficient votes to out-number the Capitalists. To-day, with the extension of the franchise as a means to stabilise present-day Society, the preponderance of working-class votes is greater than ever. Without class-consciousness, however, votes merely enable the workers to continue their enslaved condition. For women, as for men, the only hope lies in the coming of Socialism, the triumph of emancipation, without distinction of race or sex.

MAC.

A. J. COOK RETURNS TO THE FOLD.

Last year Mr. Arthur Cook joined with Mr. Maxton in publishing a document called "Our Case," in which these two "rebels" explained their dissatisfaction with the Labour Party.

In "Our Case" they made it perfectly clear that, in their view, the Labour Party's programme is not a Socialist programme. On page 17, they say:—

"Does the new Labour Party Programme aim at the speedy transfer to the State, under the control of the workers, of the great basic industries of the country, and the development of these industries towards a Socialistic system of production for use? Not in our opinion. If every measure in the Labour Party Programme was carried, then we would not have Socialism but rationalised capitalism, in which the main industries of the country remain in the hands of the exploiting capitalist class, supplemented by State ownership of the transport, electricity supply and coal-producing services with a view to giving the owners of capitalist industry a cheaper service in respect of transport and power."

On page 23 they continue with their denunciation of the Labour programme:—

"We believe that the Labour Party should scrap its existing programme and develop a vigorous Socialist Programme. That is our case, and we leave it to the working class to judge whether it is a good one or not. We do not enter upon this campaign light-heartedly, but having entered upon it we mean to go through with it to the end. We are engaged in no merely emotional campaign. If the workers accept our policy then they must work to make it the policy of the Labour Movement by electing to positions of trust those who support this vigorous Socialist policy. *The fight within the Labour Movement to-day is a fight between the forces of Socialism and those who have fallen under the influence of capitalism.*"

(Our italics.)

Since the writing of that pamphlet no essential change has occurred in the economic or political situation, nor in the contents of the Labour Party's programme. Yet we find Mr. Cook writing in the "Miner" (March 9th, 1929) as follows:—

The only Party whom we can look to for help and support in time of need and trouble is our own Labour Party, which is pledged to repeal the Eight Hour Act, amend the Compensation Act, secure pensions at 60, raise the school age, institute a minimum wage and safety in the mines, with a practical scheme for the nationalisation of the mines, minerals and by-products. We know this cannot be accomplished in the twinkling of an eye, but will take time, but they are the only Party who can and will do it. Therefore it is the bounden duty of all of us to put on one side disagreements or personal differences and work for a majority Labour Government at the next General Election.

Mr. Cook calls himself a socialist, yet he tells us that the only party deserving of working-class support is that party whose programme, in his own words, means "rationalised capitalism." Naturally, Mr. Cook's change of front has brought on his head wild denunciations and charges of "treachery" from the communists who so recently were backing him. But in truth it is not Mr. Cook's lack of knowledge of the elementary principles of socialism which is the real source of injury to the working class, nor his quite natural inability to resist the pressure of his colleagues even when he vaguely sees the unsoundness of their policies. The real source of danger is the state of mind among the working class which permits them to put their trust in the Cooks, or the Baldwins, or any other political leader, and for this the communists who now direct their man-hunt against Cook are as much responsible as any one. The power for harm of Mr. Cook or any leader depends directly upon the amount of trust placed in him. Those who teach the working class to trust in leaders are thereby preparing the ground in which are sown harvests of treachery or disillusion. If Mr. Cook had no following of people in the habit of placing implicit and uncritical trust in his judgments, his change of front would have no particular significance. As it is, however, those who have followed Cook in the past will now either follow him again and give their support to the Labour Programme, or perhaps allow their disappointment to disgust them with any kind of political activity. Our method, and the only effective method of building up a genuine socialist party, is to base our organisation on socialist knowledge, and the clear grasp of socialist principles by each member. Such a party is incapable of being harmed by the defection of individuals due to whatever cause.

H.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY AND NATIONAL DEFENCE.

DO WE WANT A NAVY?

In the *Morning Post* (February 25th), the late Right Hon. Stephen Walsh, M.P., wrote an article under the title "Labour Party and National Defence." In it he explained the attitude of a Labour Government to questions affecting the organisation and use of the Army, Navy and Air Force. As he was Secretary for War in the Labour Government, he spoke with authority and knowledge, and as he was an enthusiastic supporter of the war in 1914, and of conscription, and an avowed believer in the need to maintain the British Empire, it is not surprising that his views received ungrudging approval from the editor of the *Morning Post*. It is, of course, true that not all of Mr. Walsh's Labour colleagues were so boldly jingo during the war, nor so unrepentantly imperialistic now. But on the fundamental problem of national defence, Mr. Walsh could speak for his party, and his views would be endorsed by practically all the influential groups in it, from J. H. Thomas to the I.L.P.

Mr. Walsh's words are that the Army, Navy and Air Force are required in order that "the British citizen . . . may pursue his daily avocation in security." This is a statement acceptable by Tories, Liberals, and the Labour Party alike. It is not accepted by the Socialist Party.

Who is the "British citizen" and what is his "daily avocation"?

To come straight to the point, a point obscured by Mr. Walsh's use of undefined terms like "the nation," "our country," etc., British citizens and, in fact the citizens of all the capitalistic world, consist of two main classes. On the one side there are the propertied few, who live on property incomes, without the need to work for their living. On the other side are the great majority who are propertyless and are compelled to sell their working power for wages or salaries, to the propertied class. The one class has property to lose, and a privileged position to lose, wealth and security to lose. The other class count themselves fortunate only in being able to find employment, and life even then is arduous and insecure. The Capitalist class, in short, have something worth defending, and for its defence they maintain, and will maintain,

whatever armed forces they think necessary. Non-resistance to an attack by other capitalist governments, or defeat in war, means to them the loss of something material. Thus defeat in the Great War, the subsequent imposition of indemnities, the loss of colonies, meant the extraction of wealth from the pockets of the German capitalists—the only class who could pay—and the loss of opportunities for lucrative colonial investment. The burden of defeat has not, in fact, fallen on the German workers. The employers in defeated Germany can afford to depress the standard of living of their employees below efficiency level, no more, and no less, than can employers in victorious Britain.

The capitalist needs efficiency in his wage-slaves for the production of profit, just as the farmer needs well-fed horses and cattle. And the extent to which the German workers can, by organisation and otherwise, secure standards over and above the level required to make them efficient wealth-producers, is not importantly affected by the defeat or victory of their employers in a war with foreign capitalist states. It is conditioned by the forces of the capitalist system itself, and by the political needs of the ruling class. In times when their position is endangered from abroad, rather than in the piping times of peace, the ruling class are most willing to give concessions to their wage-slaves.

The war left the position of the German working-class and the condition of the British working-class just what it was before 1914. Both countries in 1914 were capitalist countries, governed by and for the capitalist class. The same is true in 1919 and 1929, with this difference, that whereas the British capitalists are wealthier than ever, their German colleagues have had to pay the price of military defeat.

Figures issued by German official sources disclose something of the extent of the loss of Germany's propertied class. (See "Observer," March 17th. In 1914, there were 15,549 persons with fortunes of one million marks or over; now there are only 2,235, and owners of more than £500,000 have decreased from 229 to 33.

Mr. Walsh wrote of carrying on our "daily avocation in security." We can now give more precise meaning to the phrase. The "daily avocation" of the capitalist class is the extraction of profit from the exploitation of the working-class, by whose labour wealth is produced.

German capitalists and British capitalists need armed forces to protect their privileged position, and these armed forces are intended to be used not only in war with foreign states, but also against members of the working-class who rebel against the system, whether individually or collectively. This we see in times of industrial conflict, strikes, lock-outs, etc.

Members of the working-class, on the other hand, do not enjoy the possession of battleships and howitzers, poison-gas, and aeroplanes to enable them to pursue their "daily avocation in security," because the threat to them comes not from foreign capitalists in particular, but from the capitalist class in general. The ruling class in Germany in 1914 did not construct great armaments at enormous cost in order to disturb the normal pre-war army of British unemployed in their "daily avocation" of looking for a job; nor to rob the workers of their slums, nor to interfere with the activities of those British workers who were fortunate enough to have employment. The object of the capitalist class in general is to exploit the working class. When capitalist states quarrel, the object of the quarrel and the prize for the victor is a re-division of the wealth of which the working-class are, under capitalism, normally robbed. Armaments exist to give the capitalists security. The position of the workers is as secure or insecure in defeat as in victory. The workers have nothing to defend. National Defence is a purely capitalist question. Not national defence, but the overthrow of capitalism is the object of the Socialist Party.

H.

ISLINGTON.

A LECTURE

will be given at

144, SEVEN SISTERS ROAD, N.7,
(Entrance Thane Villas)

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 10th, at 8 o'clock.

COM. E. FAIRBROTHER, on
"THE CURSE OF COMPROMISE"

ALSO

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 24th,
COM. E. GINSBURG, on
"THE TREACHERY OF THE
COMMUNIST PARTY."

Admission Free.

Questions and Discussion.

SIDELIGHTS ON LENIN.

"Reminiscences of Lenin," by Clara Zetkin.
Modern Books, Ltd. 2s. and 1s.

This brief account of recollections of Lenin is written by the German Communist, Clara Zetkin, formerly an active member of the Social Democratic Party. Quite a large part of the book is occupied with Lenin's criticism of the German Communist Party.

The relations of the workers' struggle towards art and culture is also dwelt upon by Lenin in his discussions with the author and other women. Lenin upon one occasion pointed out that millions in Russia "are crying out to learn the art of spelling, of writing their names, of counting; are crying for culture . . ."

Clara Zetkin said: "Don't complain so bitterly, Comrade Lenin. To a certain extent it really helped forward the revolution. It prevented the mind of the workers being stopped up and corrupted with bourgeois ideas and conceptions. Your propaganda and agitation is falling on virgin soil. It is easier to sow and to reap where you have not first of all to uproot a whole forest."

"Yes, that is true," Lenin replied, "but only within limits, or, more correctly, for a certain period of our struggle. Illiteracy was compatible with the seizure of power, with the necessity to destroy the old State apparatus. But do we destroy merely for destruction's sake? We destroy in order to build better. Illiteracy is incompatible with the task of construction."

These words of Lenin are an answer to many Bolsheviks who imagine our task of getting Socialism is hindered by education. Even Lenin's point, that it was easier to overthrow Czarism because the masses were illiterate, could only apply to countries like Russia. Modern countries depend upon an enlightened working class to even desire to abolish the established system.

Later in the book we are told how Lenin objected to the German Communist Women's Circle mainly occupying their time discussing sex and marriage. He pointed out that they should be discussing the Proletarian Revolution and the larger social question of which sex and marriage are only a part, and not even a fundamental part.

The book, while fragmentary in its treat-

ment, is interesting. It pays a great homage to the unassuming and helpful character of Lenin. A. K.

HEARD IN THE TRAIN.

Morning, Dick! Just enough room for you before "she" goes. We're lucky this morning; only twelve standing. Was just reading in the "Wail" that all the hotels in St. Moritz are booked up for visitors for the ice sports, and that London is "empty." Wish this carriage was a little more "empty," don't you? Always moaning? Surely, Dick, you are not satisfied with conditions in general, are you? It is a poor horse that hasn't a kick when it is stung with continual whipping, and you are in a worse predicament than that beast of burden, for to buy a horse needs money, but as for you—there are two million workers wandering the streets seeking a master, willing to work but unable to do so, desirous of producing the very articles we are so badly in need of—food, clothing and shelter.

Look at these vile slums we are passing now! Drab, dingy buildings, where no pure air can penetrate. They want bombarding with 15-inch shells, man. A breeder of prize pigs would scorn them rent-free, and yet we are the working class. We build the luxurious hotels and mansions of the world and have to exist in those vile dens from childhood until the master whispers in our ear that we are too old for work, and we toddle along to the workhouse. We build floating palaces to transport our masters to foreign climes, and our share of that luxury is probably a view of the "ocean greyhound" as we stand on the end of Southend Pier.

What d'ye say? Why talk of classes. Look, here's another train passing us. A few carriages are first class, some second and a lot third. Well, why not have all first class carriages? They are much more comfortable and there is no shortage of material necessary for making first class carriages. The Socialist argues that there should be but one class—the working class—for a class which doesn't work is not necessary, is but a drone in the hive and should be abolished.

Won't alter human nature, Dick? Well, the Socialist doesn't propose to alter human nature. Human nature is but man's

desire to eat, sleep and drink and reproduce his species and to experience, understand and enjoy all that civilisation can make accessible. Our aims are concentrated upon educating the workers to understand what their position in society actually is, viz., a slave class. It is not we who propose to alter anything—only the position of my foot when you've finished standing on it. The alteration or change over from Capitalism to Socialism must be accomplished by the working class themselves, and once our mission has succeeded the Socialist Party will cease to exist; its function of educating and organising the working class is the sole reason for its existence.

Oh, yes! I know you think the Labour Party ought to have a chance. They ought to have another chance to vote for another war—the same as they voted for the last war. Do you forget the alliances they have made at elections when they have amalgamated with the Liberals, and vice-versa? Here! look at that "Daily Herald" placard on that bookstall—"We gave four winners yesterday." Come on, buy the SOCIALIST STANDARD and we'll give you a winner—back Socialism for the Human Race—there is no other running; it's bound to win.

Well, here we are, Dick. Think it over during the day. There's probably a branch of the Socialist Party your way. Call round; they'll be glad to see you.

H. G.

CORRECTION.

The date when Zaghlul took office in the Egyptian Government was wrongly printed in last issue as 1914. It should have been 1924.

Contributions are earnestly invited to assist us with the expense of publishing more literature.

A Public Debate.

THE I.L.P. OR S.P.G.B.

Which Party should the working class support?

SPEAKERS—

A. MARSHALL DISTON (I.L.P.)

E. HARDY (S.P.G.B.)

STRATFORD TOWN HALL,

SUNDAY, APRIL 7th, at 7.30 p.m.

Doors Open 7 p.m.

Admission Free

OFFICIAL NOTICE.

All communications for the Executive Committee, Subscriptions for the SOCIALIST STANDARD, Articles, and Correspondence submitted for insertion therein, should be addressed—The Socialist Party of Great Britain, 17, Mount Pleasant, London, W.C.1, to whom Money Orders should be made payable. The meetings of the Executive Committee are held at the Head Office, every Tuesday, at 7.30 p.m.

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTIONS.

Twelve Months, post free.. .. 2s. 6d.
Six Months, post free 1s. 3d.

The Socialist Standard,

APRIL,



1929

THE LABOUR PARTY AND UNEMPLOYMENT.

Writing in the *Morning Post* (February 18th), Mr. Tom Shaw, M.P., Minister of Labour in the Labour Government, gave a statement of his Party's policy with regard to unemployment.

The first point to notice is that Mr. Shaw without hesitation accepts the view that unemployment in this country is a national problem to be solved on national lines. His criticism of the captains of industry here is that they have allowed their foreign competitors to out-distance them:—

Rationalisation, standardisation, combination, and centralisation, have made relatively more progress in other countries than our own.

Mr. Shaw blandly assumes that more rationalisation will mean less unemployment, something the very reverse of the truth. These various processes are introduced with the set purpose of securing economy in production; a greater output with the employment of fewer workers; the continual addition of surplus workers to the army of the unemployed. If Mr. Shaw does not believe this, will he show us the capitalist countries where unemployment has been permanently lessened by any or all of the means he enumerates?

Then he goes on to say that it "makes his heartache" to go into country towns and villages and see the shops "full of

Danish products." He wants British tum-mies lined with British butter made by British hands from the milk of British cows, reared on British grass. He does not dislike the Danes. He has to be sure a profound admiration for their success as exporters of dairy produce. The whole secret of their success "is that Denmark's farmers have adopted co-operation and scientific methods." Mr. Shaw wants British farmers to adopt the same methods and secure the same success. Beautiful; but how will this solve the unemployment problem? Denmark suffers just as much from unemployment as any other capitalist country, and when the promised greater efficiency of British farmers threatens to ruin their Danish competitors, some Danish Mr. Shaw will be telling his compatriots to adopt still more efficient methods, with the object of still further under-cutting the prices of dairy products; and so on in the manner normal to the capitalist system.

SOMETHING ROTTEN IN THE STATE OF DENMARK.

Mr. Shaw is careful to say that he does not hate the Danes. It is then difficult to see why he discriminates between them and other peoples also unfortunate enough not to have been born British. For although the sight of Danish eggs makes his heart ache, he goes on in the next column to say that "every effort ought to be made to develop trade to a much larger degree" with "China, India, and Russia." Does Mr. Shaw really believe that trade with China, Russia and India, or with any other country, can be developed on a one-sided basis consisting only of the export of British manufactures without corresponding imports from those countries? Why do Danish eggs make his heart ache, but not Chinese eggs? and Danish butter, but not Russian butter? When Russia buys agricultural machinery, tractors and ploughs and other means of increasing the productivity of Russian agriculture, the effect will be to throw still cheaper Russian wheat on to the British market to undercut British farmers.

Mr. Shaw also wants to develop Empire trade, and says: "We want to see . . . Canadian fruits and Canadian grain far more widely sold in our markets." And what about British fruit growers and grain growers? Is it any nicer to be ruined by Canadian competitors than by Danes? And

again how will this solve the unemployment problem?

FOREIGN TRADE AND UNEMPLOYMENT.

Mr. Shaw makes the usual assumption that unemployment can be reduced by the development of export trade and by the development of home manufactures. Let us remind him, therefore, that in 1928 exports were greater than in 1927, and imports were less than in 1927.

The total amount of wealth produced in this country was greater, yet at the end of 1928 the numbers unemployed were 200,000 or more above the level at the end of 1927. More wealth and more exports accompanied by more unemployment!

Lastly, Mr. Shaw speaks of remedying unemployment by reducing the expenditure on armaments. What is going to happen to the thousands of men now withdrawn from the labour market for service in the forces? What of the ship workers engaged in naval construction and the engineers employed in the manufacture of rifles, ammunition, etc.?

And, lastly, does he not recall that in 1924 the Labour Government incurred some criticism because it laid down 5 new cruisers, and that one of the reasons given by authoritative Labour Ministers for that step was the need for making employment?

WHAT LLOYD GEORGE PROMISED IN 1906.**"BUNGLER OR ROGUE?"**

Mr. Lloyd George has made a definite pledge that if returned to power his party will "reduce the terrible figures of the workless in the course of a single year to normal proportions." (Lloyd George's address to Liberal candidates on March 1st, 1929.) The unemployed are to be absorbed in road and bridge work, in land drainage, telephone development, house building and other schemes, financed by means of a big loan. By "normal proportions" is meant the pre-war 4.7 per cent., "representing something over half-a-million unemployed." (See "We Can Conquer Unemployment," p. 6.) It is, of course, not impossible for capitalist governments to put some or all of the unemployed on camouflaged relief works and call this the abolition of unemployment. We are, therefore, much more concerned with an earlier, comprehensive, and totally unfulfilled pledge,

which was given by Mr. Lloyd George in 1906. Speaking at Birmingham on October 22nd of that year, Mr. Lloyd George referred to signs of widespread unrest among the workers, and said:—

The new movement represented a real upheaval, due to the impatience of the people of the slow progress made by existing parties, in redressing wrongs. . . . No wonder the people asked "why all this tarrying and dallying?" They said to the old political parties, "If you are in earnest you are bunglers; if you are not in earnest you are rogues!"

WHAT THE LIBERALS WOULD DO IN THREE YEARS.

Mr. Lloyd George confessed that past "reforms" had failed to cure the evils for which they were intended as a remedy.

Here you have been tinkering for generations with reform, and the end of it all is slums, pauperism, and great want in a land of plenty.

He then gave his definite pledge that the Liberals would achieve something material in three years or forfeit their claim to the confidence of the electorate:—

The answer rested with the Liberals during the next three years. . . . The people had said to them "We are going to give you your chance, but it is only a chance." The whole future of the Liberal Party depended upon the practical answer they gave to the expectations of the people.

THE PLEDGE BROKEN.

So much for the pledge. Now for the performance.

Speaking at Park Hall, Cardiff, on December 29th, 1911, that is five years after the giving of the pledge, Mr. Lloyd George said:—

To-day you have greater poverty in the aggregate in the land than you have ever had. You have oppression of the weak by the strong. You have a more severe economic bondage than you probably ever had; for grinding labour to-day does not always guarantee sustenance or security. At any rate that condition of things was foreign to the barbaric régime of the darker ages. (Supplement to *Christian Commonwealth*, January 17th, 1912.)

THE FUTILITY OF REFORMING CAPITALISM.

More than 20 years have passed since then. Numerous "reforms" have in those years been placed on the statute book, by Liberals, by Tories, and by the Labour Party, yet the position has become so much worse in many respects that Mr. Lloyd George can actually dazzle the eyes of thousands of working-class voters by pro-

misgiving to reduce unemployment to its pre-war level, that is to take us back to the condition of "normal" poverty and insecurity depicted by him in 1911.

This is capitalist "progress"; the natural fruit of Tory, Liberal, and Labour reforms of capitalism. Only Socialism will remove the causes of working-class poverty by abolishing the private ownership of the means of producing and distributing wealth. You are poor, whether in work or out, whether trade is good or bad, and whether capitalism is organised in independent companies, in combines, or in the State capitalist or nationalised undertakings so beloved of the Labour Party.

You are poor because the capitalist class own and control your means of living (the land, factories, railways, etc.) and live on the wealth you produce. This is capitalism. Why not end it?

MR. WHEATLEY'S FRIENDS.

Under the Labour Government, Mr. Wheatley, as Minister of Health, was responsible for a Housing Act. When he introduced the Bill in the House, Mr. Wheatley pointed out to some Conservative critics that "The proposals which I am submitting are real capitalism—an attempt to patch up, in the interests of humanity, a capitalist ordered society" (Parliamentary Debates, June 3rd, 1924).

Mr. Wheatley's consideration for his capitalist friends has not gone unappreciated among them. A public meeting was called by the Property Owners' Protection Association at the Cannon Street Hotel on March 1st to protest against Section 46 of the Housing Act, 1925, passed by the Conservative Government. At the meeting an attack was made on Mr. Chamberlain, present Minister of Health, and Mr. E. T. Campbell, M.P., rose to protest. "I ask you," said Mr. Campbell, "whether you prefer Mr. Chamberlain as Minister or Mr. Wheatley?" This question, according to the *Daily Telegraph* (March 2nd), was greeted with cries of "Mr. Wheatley."

TO OUR READERS. PLEASE NOTE.

The "Socialist Standard" can be obtained from the following Newsagents—
Coombs & Fancourt, 548, Barking Road, Plaistow.
A. E. Cohen, 297, Barking Road, East Ham.
H. Williams, 36, Barking Road, Canning Town.
C. W. Honess, 63, Stratford Road, Plaistow.
H. S. Bailey, 42, Tower Bridge Road, S.E.
R. Clifton, 153½, Blackfriars Road, S.E.

A LETTER FROM AN AUSTRALIAN READER.

Dear Comrades,

As we have just recently got over an election, it would be interesting to you to have a few words in connection with this important event in the lives of the Free Australian Workers.

The employing class won again or, rather, the workers here handed the political machinery over to the representatives of their masters to do with as they may. The Bruce Nationalist Government got a majority, but only with the aid of the Country Party, and although the so-called Labour Party is the largest individual party in the House, they have to take a back seat owing to the pact between the Country Party and the Nats.

As usual, during the campaign we had the old cries trotted out. The most emphasised was that of "Law and order," which was trumpeted through all the agencies of the master class. The Nationalists accused the Labourites of wanting to subvert the constitution of the country to the "Communist-revolutionary-disloyal-bolshevik-moscovian-red" policy of the extremists, and the Labourites just as emphatically denied the charge. Just how revolutionary the Labour proposals were can be gauged by the fact that the Federal Treasurer accused the Labour Party of stealing the Nationalist's Party's policy, and the Labour leader, Mr. Scullin, threw the charge back in his teeth with the accusation that the Nats. had stolen Labour's programme.

Comparing the two policies, one is hard put to it to find a great deal of difference. Of course, both are straight out for Capitalism, but each have certain little peculiarities which are probably inserted for the purpose of making a noticeable distinction for the benefit of the electors. Both parties contained the following proposals in their programmes:—

- Retention of the White Australian Policy.
- Loyalty to the British Empire.
- Industrial Peace.
- Law and Order.
- Interests of the Community.

While they are prating about the White Australian Policy, the Nationalist Federal Government is allowing Coolie Labour to discharge ships on which White Australians refused to work for reduced pay which a constitu-

tional Arbitration Court has forced upon them. And the Coolie labour is being protected by State Police under a Labour Government. This is the same State Government (Queensland) which dismissed 11,000 railway men because they refused to black-leg last year on the sugar workers. They also stopped the unemployment dole during the strike on the excuse that there was plenty of work on the wharves.

As far as the British Empire goes, when Bruce (Nat.) accused Scullin (Lab.) of not being loyal because he never mentioned the Empire in his political speech, Scullin replied that as he thought that everybody knew how unswerving his loyalty was, he did not think it necessary to stress the point.

As for industrial peace, what they are going to do in this regard is almost beyond comprehension. Mond will be jealous. Havelock Wilson will jump with joy when he hears how his gospel of Industrial Peace is permeating the intellectual pates of our Capitalist apologists. The Labour Party say that Bruce (Nat.) has had his chance for six years to bring about Industrial Peace but he has failed. Consequently, they ought to be given an opportunity to show just how they can do the job. All the Labour politicians gave it out that "Labour" is the only party that can usher in this Peaceful Industrial Era. And they are right, too. If they cannot quieten the workers, then nobody can. Has not Premier McCormack fought against the workers on every opportunity? He has allowed seamen to be jailed for refusing to sail in ships loaded by black-legs. He has allowed the police to be used to protect Italian workers who, owing to their ignorance of local affairs, have been used to break strikes, and to reduce the standard of living.

During the recent water-front strike, the Victorian State so-called Labour Government allowed the police to shoot down wharf-labourers (dockers) who were kicking against reductions in wages and worsening of conditions.

Just prior to the dissolution of the last Parliament, the Nationalist Government passed an Amended Arbitration Bill. All the Labour Polities designated the Bill as a Union-smashing medium, attacked the Government for introducing it, and held public meetings telling the workers not to submit to this dastardly piece of iniquitous legisla-

tion, etc., etc., and yet when the Waterside Workers repudiated an award given under this very Bill, they were told to get back to work by the most loud-mouthed denunciators of the Bill. But then, it is not expedient for the workers to strike at election times, as it reacts on the Labour Party or, at least, the Labourites say it does. The most flagrant betrayals of the workers of this country have taken place during election times when the slaves are told that if they do anything "It will jeopardise the Labour Party at the elections." To this political dirge the conditions of the workers are allowed to be broken down almost without protest in many cases.

Another sop the Labour Party dished up for the workers was the Leg-puller for the Ladies, namely, Child-Endowment. This has been a great election cry for Labour for a long time now. But a few years ago the Labour Party got into Power in New South Wales, and Mr. Lang introduced this wonderful "humane" legislation. This is what their own supporters said about it in the "Australian Worker" (Sydney, 28/10/27):—

... As a matter of fact, the Family Endowment Act—for which, in its present form, the Nationalist Members in the N.S.W. Upper House are entirely responsible—is "manna from Heaven" for the employers.

It is now common knowledge that if the N.S.W. basic wage had been increased, in accordance with the increase in the cost of living, the increase would have been 12s. per week, or approximately an addition to the wages bill of the State of something like £13,000,000. Under the Family Endowment Act the employers' contributions amount to £3,000,000 per annum—equal, as Industrial Commissioner Piddington pointed out, to an increase of 3s. per week in the basic wage.

It is plain that, because of the adoption of Child Endowment, the employers in New South Wales have been made a present of something like £10,000,000 per annum, which they would have had to pay if the basic wage had been computed on the old basis. Industry in New South Wales can hardly be said to be unduly penalised when, as a matter of fact, the employers are actually saving £10,000,000 per annum because of the change in the method of computing wages.

The excuse that the Nationalist Members of the Upper House are responsible for the Bill "in its present form" is a sly get out. Prior to this, Labour Premier Lang had flooded the Upper House with Labour Members with a view to abolishing that Chamber. Unfortunately, the appointed ones were so true to Labour that they could not forsake its old policy of twist and turn,

with the result that when they were appointed, they ratted on the Party and the Chamber is still in existence.

The election result has rather a "Gilbertian" touch about it. Although the Nationalists lost several seats, and Labour did not get the Governmental Benches, both parties expressed the greatest of pleasure when the number went up.

Several commercial papers were counting on Labour getting in; in fact, were hoping that Labour would do the trick with a view to getting Theodore, ex-Premier of Queensland, in a position where he would be able to use his "administrative ability" in the interests of the Australian manufacturers. Knowing his record in Queensland, they had the greatest faith in him to look after the welfare of the "community." However, they slipped, and they will have to wait another three years for Ted unless he goes the way of all (Labour) flesh, that is, into the ranks of the Nationalists.

PAMPHLETS FOR SALE.

We have had a big demand for the pamphlets published by the Socialist Party of Canada, and the following can still be supplied—

"Wage-Labour and Capital" (Marx), 60 pages, 4d.

"Communist Manifesto" (Marx and Engels), 59 pages, 4d.

"Causes of Belief in God" (Lafargue), 48 pages, 6d.

"Socialism—Utopian and Scientific" (Engels), 95 pages, 6d.

"Value, Price and Profit" (Marx), 78 pages, 6d.

Note.—Postage extra; ½d. per copy.

NOW ON SALE.

MANIFESTO THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN.

Sixth Edition—With New Preface.
Price 2d. Post Free, 2½d.

An Armoury of facts exposing the Labour Party,
I.L.P. and similar "Labour Organisations."

COMMUNIST PARTY CONTORTION.

The Communist Party at its formation opposed the Labour Party. Then for a time they supported and opposed Labour candidates in different places at the same time. Finally they gave them unqualified support everywhere. They now propose a new line of action which involves opposition to the Labour Party once again. Though claiming to oppose, they still desire to affiliate with them, but "the fight for affiliation, however, must be converted into an offensive fight against the treacherous leadership of the Labour Party" (*The Communist*, April, 1928).

Apparently all would be considered well if the Communists could only become the new leaders of the old politically ignorant followers. The way these would-be revolutionaries propose to "come out" as an independent political party is to change their attitude towards the Labour Party and Labour Government, by replacing the slogan of "Labour Government" by the slogan of "Revolutionary Workers' Government." This drastic change need not alarm their vote-catching competitors, the Labour Party, because "in some districts active support to Labourites, who pledge themselves to vote for the elementary demands of the Working Class and accepting the Communist Party into the Labour Party is admissible." (*Ibid.*)

Needless to say, these pledges, and more if necessary, will be given to such political simpletons if the votes are forthcoming. The Labourites know how to outdo even the Liberals at that game, because the *Daily Herald* (March 4th) tells us that the Lloyd George gamble for votes "is a good programme as far as it goes. There is not an item in it to which the next Labour Government is not committed." Add to that some of the Communists' very elementary demands, which include Land Nationalisation and the Abolition of the Monarchy, and we get some idea of what "revolutionary" means to a Communist. Those who do seek to revolutionise society, and not to reform and patch it, will not be misled by Communist clamour. Such aspirants to Leadership must, like their Labour brethren, trim their sails in order to cater for the muddle-headed discontents who are looking around for a party that appears to them to offer most in exchange for their

votes. Only voters with Socialist knowledge know that it is not Parliament as such that can achieve their objective, but a Parliament that contains representatives of an organised working class outside it. We do not expect the capitalists to surrender unless faced with an organised working class in control of political machinery, nor do we imagine for a moment that such an experienced class will be disturbed by any intellectual (!) minority with a following fed on silly slogans and chatter about "disarming the Bourgeoisie."

The political control that the working class will acquire as a result of Socialist knowledge, including control of the armed forces, will be acquired only when they gain such knowledge, and, therefore, cease to support capitalist agents. There will then be no power available for use by the master class that could prevent an organised majority of workers from using the present political machinery to establish Socialism.

MAC.

BOUND VOLUMES.

Bound volumes of the SOCIALIST STANDARD can now be supplied as follows:—

1-year Volume	September 1910, to August, 1911	6/6
2-year Volume	September, 1910, to August, 1912	8/6
3-year Volume	September, 1910, to August, 1913	10/6
4-year Volume	September, 1910, to August, 1914	12/6
1-year Volume.	September, 1914, to August, 1915	6/6
2-year Volume.	September, 1914, to August, 1916	8/6
3-year Volume	September, 1914, to August, 1917	10/6
4-year Volume	September, 1914, to August, 1918	12/6
1-year Volume.	Since September, 1918	4/3
2-year Volume	Since September, 1918	6/6
3-year Volume.	Since September, 1918	9/-

Postage extra

A CURIOUS "CLASS" WAR.

As an insight into the minds of the people to whom it is necessary to direct propaganda, surely there has been nothing better for some time than a little incident just lately reported in the *Daily News* and which they describe as a cruel hoax upon 10,000 hungry ex-Service men.

In the issue of that paper dated January 9th the report is made of a rumour which was spread in regard to the proposed Ford factory at Dagenham and, according to which, a contingent of 400 miners were being brought to Romford with the object of work associated with this factory being given to them. The report continued that the unemployed ex-Service men in the district accepted the rumour as true and that in consequence 500 of them went to the neighbourhood of the proposed factory to offer resistance, by force if necessary, to what they regarded as an unfair measure and so as to obtain for themselves all such temporary jobs as there might be available.

The point to be noted is that one section of the working class was prepared, if necessary, to use violent methods in order to coerce a number of other workers suffering from the direst poverty—possibly in a sorrier plight than they themselves were in—to take no advantage from this possibility of a job. An intention by one section of workers, we may say, to fight another section in order to get a job—the only thing all workers now live for.

What a sad reflection it induces as to the state of their minds. Or, rather, what a reflection upon the means used to produce that state of mind.

Communists imagine that, by some method that they alone understand but which they are entirely incapable of explaining, that they are going to lead such a divided rabble against all the powerful, devastating and horror-producing means of destruction that the capitalists know so well how to use, in an attempt to overthrow the capitalist class.

Just imagine the case of these ex-Service men. Having been willing to make every possible sacrifice for "their" country and that glorious Empire upon which the sun never rises, they come home to this country of "theirs" and in which their permission to live is conceded by the luxurious provision of a dole or a pension, and are willing to fight men by whose side they fought in

the War in an attempt to secure a job which it is certain would only be temporary from a firm owned by those "hated foreigners" who have brought the art of exploitation to the highest pitch of efficiency.

The Press and capitalist parties, the school histories, religion, etc., we know, are responsible, as we also know who foster the "education" supplied through these agencies.

There is only one conclusion: the nature of capitalism and the remorseless and ruthlessly brutal nature of the pirates who exploit them will have to be brought home in a very clear manner to a very large number of workers before a Socialist society becomes a nearer possibility.

Miners, ex-Service men and others:
Wake up! G. M. A.

NOW ON SALE!

A Reprint of the Second Edition

OF

"Socialism and Religion."

This unique Party Pamphlet is now reprinted at a price within the reach of all.

48 pages. TWOPENCE. 2½d. post free.

KNOWLEDGE.

The following Books can be obtained from Head Office:—

Anarchism and Socialism. Plechanoff. 3/6, paper 1/2.

Civil War in France. Marx. 2/9.

Conditions of the Working Class in England in 1844. Engels. 5/-

Critique of Political Economy. Marx. 6/6.

18th Brumaire of Louis Napoleon. Marx. 3/6.

Evolution of Property. Lafargue. 3/6, limp 1/6.

Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State. Engels. 3/6.

Poverty of Philosophy. Marx. 6/6.

Revolution and Counter-Revolution. Marx. 3/6, limp 1/6.

Social and Philosophical Studies. Lafargue. 3/6.

Socialism: Utopian and Scientific. Engels. 3/6, limp 1/6. Postage extra.

A FOGGY KNIGHT on SOCIALISM.

Through a twenty-four page article in a 3/6 monthly ("Fortnightly Review," February and March issues), Sir Reginald Mitchell-Banks, M.P., asserts, warns, and re-asserts regarding what he terms "The shifting sands of Socialism." The amount of Socialist criticism his contribution contains may be estimated by the fact that he merely concerns himself with the vague definitions given by such enemies of Socialism as Philip Snowden, Sydney Webb and Bernard Shaw. By this method he avoids the task of having to meet scientific generalisations and provable theories. By assuming that Nationalisation, Municipalisation and other forms of Capitalist development are Socialism, Sir Mitchell reaches the conclusions he wishes to arrive at. This question-begging method makes it easy then to attribute Capitalistically-produced evils to Socialism. It can then be shown that where Socialism has been "experimented with" that "not one success has been recorded." In fairness to our critic, we will allow that he states: "All I can do is to indicate what I believe to be the essential points in the Socialist case." We then see how convenient is such a proviso. Sir Mitchell claims that: "Socialism is based on the ground that Capitalism has failed to provide a decent standard of life for the mass of the people." What is "decent" we are not told, but we may add that Capitalism is the Capitalists' own system, and presupposes a working-class who are content to provide their masters with luxury and comfort while accepting a slave's portion themselves. That Capitalism has failed to provide a "decent standard" for the mass, our critic says is "demonstrably contrary to facts." On the very next page we are told that this same Capitalism has "found colossal annual sums for assistance of children, the aged, the sick and the unemployed," and a few lines further on that there is no evidence to prove that Socialism will abolish the evils which he now tells us "admittedly still exist." Of course, Russia has to be touched on because "there you may see Socialism of the Marxian type in being, and it is beyond doubt a failure." Same method of unsupported assertion, same want of evidence that it is Socialism. Instead, we get another contradiction, for we learn that: "Wherever you discern a ray of light it is produced by a resumption of Capitalist methods." This is a novel

method of making your case good, for we are to believe that there are two social systems in existence in Russia. Where Sir Mitchell sees in Russia what he terms failure, it is labelled "Marxism in being," and where he sees "rays of light" (presumably wages, trade, profit) they are produced by Capitalist methods. Very convenient! We claim, and have supplied evidence in the past, that Capitalism is the system in vogue in Russia at present. Social systems cannot be tried one day and abandoned the next in the fantastic manner inferred. All the material, economic and intellectual, for the establishment of a new system of society is generated in the system that precedes it. Advanced Capitalist countries have developed the necessary industrial technique, but the intellectual material for the establishment of Socialism, a Socialist majority of workers, has yet to be generated in these countries. This is more so in economically and politically backward Russia, where the majority are peasants and large scale social production, the basis for Socialism, has still to be developed. Sir Mitchell's article is a wind-beating onslaught upon a "Socialism" of his own making. His attempted criticism makes one wonder why members of the Capitalist class are not wise enough to leave such tasks to their hired journalists. They, at least, would hardly exhibit such mental poverty as is contained in the following statement, made without a scrap of evidence to support it: "Nothing worth mentioning is left of Marx as an economist or as a prophet. It seems his speciality was being wrong." The best answer to this is to advise readers to study for themselves the correctness of an analysis of Capitalist conditions and tendencies that has stood the onslaughts of the paid professors of the Universities for over half-a-century. Sir Reginald Mitchell Banks, M.P., may be considered a great man in Capitalist circles, but his entry into the field as a critic of Socialism reminds us that pygmies remain pygmies, even though perched on stilts.

MAC.

GET TOGETHER!

Readers of the "Socialist Standard" who desire to be put into communication with other readers in their district are invited to notify the General Secretary, at 17 Mount Pleasant, W.C.1.

LOVE YOUR ENEMIES.

Was Jesus a Communist? I don't know, search me! Bernard Shaw and the Rev. "Dick" Shephard say that he was. Prebendary Gough and the Very Rev Dean Inge, of St. Pauls, on the other hand will not stand for this. In fact one could almost say that the latter gentleman in particular, regards Communists as very unnice people. In the course of an article in the *Evening Standard* (13.3.29) entitled "Should Blood Sports be Banned?" our kindly and Very Rev. Dean becomes almost irrev.:—

There is the question of field sports and big game shooting, I have never killed anything larger than a wasp, and that was in self-defence, and it would give me no pleasure to shoot any noxious animals, except Communists.

Turn the other cheek? Well, that might do for people with less cheek!

SARCASTIGATOR.

OUR FIRST PROSPECTIVE CANDIDATE FOR PARLIAMENT

At a meeting of the Battersea Branch, Comrade Barker, of the Tooting Branch, was adopted as prospective candidate of the Socialist Party of Great Britain for Battersea.

It now remains for those who desire to see our candidate go to the polls to give practical effect to their wishes by swelling the Parliamentary Fund to the required dimensions.

As we pointed out originally, our candidates will go to the polls if we are provided with sufficient funds to carry the business through.

S.P.G.B. PROPAGANDA MEETINGS

LONDON DISTRICT.

Sundays ...	Clapham Common, 3 p.m. Tottenham, West Green Corner, 11.30 a.m. Tooting, Garrett Lane, Tooting Broadway, 7.30 p.m. Victoria Park, 4 p.m. Woolwich, Beresford Square, 7.30 p.m. Hyde Park, 11.30 a.m. Paddington, Prince of Wales, 8 p.m.
Mondays ...	Paddington, Prince of Wales, 8 p.m. Clerkenwell, Garnault Place, 8 p.m.
Wednesdays ...	Hackney, Paragon Road and Mare Street, 8 p.m. Paddington, Prince of Wales, 8 p.m.
Thursdays ...	Becontree, Rodney Street, Ilford, 8 p.m.
Fridays ..	Clerkenwell, Acton St., Grays Inn Rd. 8 p.m. West Ham, Water Lane, 8 p.m.
Saturdays ...	Wood Green, Jolly Butchers Hill, 8 p.m. Leyton, Corner Grange Park, 7.30 p.m.
HANLEY BRANCH.	
Sundays ...	Hanley Market Square, 7 p.m. Burslem, St. John Square, 7 p.m.

BRANCH DIRECTORY.

- BATTERSEA.**—Sec., 2, Hanbury-road, S.W.11. Branch meets Thursday, 8.30 p.m. at The Waiting Room, Latchmere Baths, entrance in Burns-road. Discussion second Thurs. in month.
- BECONTREE.**—Sec., Hy. Gratton, 4, Drummond Ave., Brooklands, Romford. Branch meets 1st and 3rd Wednesdays at 7.30, at above address.
- BIRMINGHAM.**—Sec. E. Jesper, 38, Rollason-rd., Erdington. Branch meets The Continental Café, Moor St., 1st and 3rd Sundays at 11 a.m.
- CAMBERWELL.**—Branch meets at Camberwell Trades Council Room, 6A, Artichoke Place, Camberwell Green, every Friday at 8.30 p.m. Discussions—public invited. Letters to Secretary at above address.
- CENTRAL.**—Membership obtained only through the Ex. Committee. Applications to General Sec.
- CLERKENWELL.**—Branch meets Wednesdays, 8 p.m., at 17, Mount Pleasant, W.C.1. Discussions first Wednesday in month at 8 p.m.—all invited. Sec., at above address.
- EAST LONDON.**—Sec., D. Jacobs, 28, Lyal Road, Bow, E.3. Branch meets 1st and 3rd Mondays at 8 p.m. at Stewart's Cafe, 195, Cambridge Rd., E.2.
- GLASGOW.**—Sec. W. Falconer, 128, Bluevale Street.
- HACKNEY.**—Branch meets Arcadian Cafe, 42, Amherst Road, Hackney, Mondays, 8 p.m., Discussions 9.30. Communication to Sec. as above.
- HANLEY.**—Branch meets Tuesdays, Working Men's Club, Glass-st. Sec., F. Goldstraw, 38, Paddock Street, Hanley.
- ISLINGTON.**—Branch meets Wednesdays, 8.30, at 144, Seven Sister-rd., Holloway, N. Sec., A. Gregory, 24, Goodinge Rd., N.7.
- LEYTON.**—Sec., A. Holland, 396, Lea Bridge-rd., Leyton. Branch meets 8 p.m., Trades and Labour Hall, Grove House, High-rd., second Mondays in month.
- MANCHESTER.**—Sec., W. Addison, 111, West Park-street, Salford, Manchester.—Branch meets 1st and 3rd Thursdays in month, 7.45 p.m.
- PADDINGTON.**—Branch meeting held on 2nd and 4th Fridays, 8 p.m., in room above the Co-operative Stores, 306, Kilburn-lane, W.9 (side door).
- SOUTHEND-ON-SEA.**—Sec., J. Bird, 5 Wellington-avenue, Westcliffe-on-Sea.
- TOOTING.**—Sec., 15, University-road, Collier's Wood, S.W.19. Branch meets every Friday at 8 p.m. at Tooting Adult School, 971, Garratt-lane, S.W.17.
- TOTTENHAM.**—Secretary, 18, Woodlands Park Rd., N.15. Branch meets Fridays, Room 2, Trades Hall, 7, Bruce Grove. Discussion after branch business. Public invited.
- WALTHAMSTOW.**—Sec., S. E. Williams, 3, Dyson-rd., Leytonstone, E.11. Branch meets at Workmen's Hall, High-st., every Monday.
- WATFORD.**—A. Lawson, Sec., 107 Kensington-avenue, Watford. Branch meets Mondays at 8.30 p.m. at Secretary's address.

WEST HAM.—Branch meets Thursdays at 8 p.m. at 167 Romford rd., Stratford. Sec., P. Hallard, 22, Colegrave-rd., Stratford, E.

WOOD GREEN.—All communications to Sec., F. W. Godfrey, 71, Falkland Road, N.8.

WOOLWICH.—Branch meets at 94, Griffin Road, Plumstead. Communications to Secretary at above address.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY

OF GREAT BRITAIN.

OBJECT.—The establishment of a system of society based upon the common ownership and democratic control of the means and instruments for producing and distributing wealth by and in the interests of the whole community.

DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain

HOLDS— That society as at present constituted is based upon the ownership of the means of living (i.e., land, factories, railways, etc.) by the capitalist or master class, and the consequent enslavement of the working class by whose labour alone wealth is produced.

That in society, therefore, there is an antagonism of interests, manifesting itself as a class struggle, between those who possess but do not produce and those who produce but do not possess.

That this antagonism can be abolished only by the emancipation of the working class from the domination of the master class, by the conversion into the common property of society of the means of production and distribution, and their democratic control by the whole people.

That as in the order of social evolution the working class is the last class to achieve its freedom, the emancipation of the working class will involve the emancipation of all mankind, without distinction of race or sex.

That this emancipation must be the work of the working class itself.

That as the machinery of government, including the armed forces of the nation, exists only to conserve the monopoly by the capitalist class of the wealth taken from the workers, the working class must organise consciously and politically for the conquest of the powers of government, national and local, in order that this machinery, including these forces, may be converted from an instrument of oppression into the agent of emancipation and the overthrow of privilege, aristocratic and plutocratic.

That as political parties are but the expression of class interests, and as the interest of the working class is diametrically opposed to the interests of all sections of the master class, the party seeking working-class emancipation must be hostile to every other party.

The SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain, therefore, enters the field of political action determined to wage war against all other political parties, whether alleged labour or avowedly capitalist, and calls upon the members of the working class of this country to muster under its banner to the end that a speedy termination may be wrought to the system which deprives them of the fruits of their labour, and that poverty may give place to comfort, privilege to equality, and slavery to freedom.

Those agreeing with the above principles and desiring enrolment in the Party should apply for membership form to secretary of nearest branch or at Head Office.

THE Socialist Standard

The Official Organ of **THE SOCIALIST PARTY** of Great Britain.

No. 297. VOL. 25.]

LONDON, MAY, 1929.

[MONTHLY, TWOPENCE.]

SOCIALISM AND THE GENERAL ELECTION.

Fellow Workers.—The Capitalist class who, through their nominees, rule this country to-day, decreed that a General Election shall take place, and you are now called upon to cast your votes.

Many candidates are put forward, each claiming to serve the interests of the bulk of the population. The history of the last hundred years or so has been in the main the record of alternative Liberal and Tory Government, and the result to your class has been a gradual worsening of conditions. Unemployment has grown steadily until it has now reached a permanent level well over a million. In every election both Liberals and Tories have brought forward proposals alleged to be "certain cures" for the evil, but time has always shown the inadequacy of their remedies.

In the present election the past will be repeated and again you will have the "certain" remedy put forward.

These remedies are put forward to catch your vote, because you are the majority of the nation and can put in or put out whom you wish. Beware, therefore, of golden promises, and do not too readily accept assertions as evidence, nor be bewildered into agreement by the figure juggling of artful politicians.

Your position is simple, and your attitude is clear if you will but give a little time and thought to certain basic truths. Briefly your position to-day is as follows:—

1. You are poor to-day and haunted with the dread of unemployment because you do not own the means for producing wealth. In consequence you depend for your living upon the wishes and the whims of employers.

2. The employers take no active part in

the work of production, yet its fruits are reaped by them.

3. The employers pile up great riches for themselves by paying you less as wages and salaries than the value of what you make by your work. This must be true, otherwise they could not enjoy the good things of life without working whilst you are hard put to it to live at all though spending your lives in toil.

4. There is no natural or supernatural law that gives to any one the power to take land or the things on the land from his fellows. Social laws are made by man, and in civilized society by the rulers, and these rulers have been and are the owners of property, the employers. The laws they have made have spread a mantle of rightness over their exploitation of the worker. To use the labour of another in order to achieve riches for oneself is to exploit that other, and the employers, or capitalists, live by the exploitation of the workers.

5. The Capitalist are one class, owning the means of production, and having them set in motion only when profit is expected either immediately or at a later date. The workers are another class, owning in the main nothing but their power to work, and compelled to sell this working power to the Capitalist in order to live. These two classes make up the vast bulk of the population.

6. The interests of these two classes are opposite interests. The Capitalist aims at securing as much production as possible with the least employment of labour—that is with the smallest expenditure of wages.

The interest of the worker, on the contrary, is to obtain as much work as possible and as high wages as he can. The ultimate interest of the Capitalist is the obtaining of

secure and peaceful control of the whole of Society by a small group living in magnificent style and employing the minimum amount of workers. What then is to become of the rest of the population is the problem that has so far eluded the politicians. The ultimate interest of the workers is to remove from their backs the useless drones they have fed for so long. In other words, to obtain control of the means of production they operate, and, along with that, the control of all social machinery.

7. Between Capitalist and worker, therefore, there is not and cannot be an identity of interests. One is an exploited, the other an exploiting class. The remedy for the social troubles that no soft words can hide does not lie in the direction of a harmony of interests. The interests conflict at the base and, consciously or not, there is in society a struggle between the two main groups of the population which, in a minor way, breaks out in the form of strikes, that are met by ruthless repression. Neither by holiness nor by hellishness is there a way out, leaving untouched the fundamental cleavage into classes based upon the private ownership of the main resources of wealth production.

8. The way out then lies in one direction only, the revolutionizing of society; the overturning of its base; the converting of the means of production into the common property of society, commonly owned and democratically controlled by and in the interests of the whole people. The emancipation of the wage slaves from their age-long thralldom.

This is where the Socialist Party stands. We do not advocate reform, we advocate revolution. Reforms in the main are an effort to hide and not to get rid of evils. At the best they have only a temporary effect, and the more determined the workers show themselves in the movement to take from the Capitalists their power, that is to say, the more dangerous to the Capitalist regime the workers become the more ready will the Capitalist be to put forward reforms in the effort to stem the revolutionary flood.

The control of society resides in Parliament, the centre of State power to-day. To get this power the workers must send delegates to Parliament in sufficient numbers to obtain their majority. The Capitalists know this, and use their utmost resources to ensure that their nominees shall be returned. Where they fail they buy over the workers'

representatives by promises and praise.

The success of the Capitalist efforts to buy over the workers' nominees depends upon the attitude of the workers. Where the worker votes for a *man* and not for principles then the buying of the man is the buying of the *followers*. Herein lies the danger and the curse of leadership. Where, however, the workers vote for principles only, then the buying of delegates ultimately becomes a problem beyond even the vast wealth of the Capitalists.

We therefore urge the workers to obtain a firm grasp of the simple facts of their slave position and the way out. To send delegates to Parliament to carry out their instructions and under their control.

In the present election the Socialist Party are putting forward candidates whose object is to work for the ushering in of Socialism as speedily as possible; to remove the Capitalists from power, not to compromise with them.

Remember no Heaven-sent Saviour is coming to lead you out of your difficulties. The problem is yours, and you must solve it for yourselves.

"The emancipation of the working class must be the work of the working class itself."

We are a group of working men and women. We publish a monthly paper, the "Socialist Standard," in which the position of the Party is set forth month by month with views and criticisms on various matters that arise. We invite you to read it carefully and question our speakers so that you may thoroughly understand what we are and where we are making for. We know that once you understand us you will be with us and help in the work of establishing Socialism.

A SOCIAL.

Members and Friends are invited to a Social at

THE MINERVA CAFE,
HIGH HOLBORN
(Bury St. Corner).

Saturday, May 18th, 1929,

from 7 p.m. to 11 p.m.

ADMISSION FREE.

THE PARTIES AND THE ELECTION.

THE PARTY OF "DEEDS"—THE CONSERVATIVES.

The Conservatives are fighting the election on their past record. They survey the existing condition of this country and ask you, the electors, to agree that it is good. In the words used by Mr. Baldwin in his speech at Drury Lane Theatre on April 18th—

You may judge us by what we have done.
(Reported in "Daily Telegraph," 19 April, 1929.)

It has been agreed by the Conservatives, the Liberals and the Labour Party that the main question on which the election is to be fought is unemployment and the possibility of finding a cure for it. Mr. Baldwin in a speech at Bristol on April 25th (See "Times" Report, 26th April) was content to point out that even if some 10 per cent. of the workers are unemployed there is great comfort to be derived from the knowledge that the other 90 per cent. are working and "are enjoying a higher standard of life than has ever been enjoyed before." He also expressed a modest hope that given freedom from social "hurricanes and cataclysms" unemployment will be "reduced to normal by a natural process in three or four years."

This kind of pledge is as safe as any of the ambiguities produced by Old Moore. What, to begin with, is normal? When an unemployed army of about 1½ millions exists over a period of some eight years or more it is "normal." And what is to prevent the Conservative Government, whenever it may wish to do so, from producing the requisite "social hurricanes," as in 1926, by engineering large industrial disputes? And even without that rather drastic method, they can fall back on the simple device of "abolishing unemployment" by disentitling claimants for unemployment pay and passing them on to the Poor Law, or giving the older workers a meagre pension to secure their withdrawal from the labour market.

THE LABOUR PARTY AND THE LIBERALS— THE PARTIES OF "PROMISES."

The Liberals, knowing full well that they are not in the least likely to receive a majority of seats in the new House of Commons, the fighting on Mr. Lloyd George's schemes for providing work for the unemployed. Whereas Mr. Baldwin believes that "by a natural process" the volume of

unemployment will be reduced to normal in three or four years, Mr. Lloyd George promises to secure the same result in a year.

The Labour Party have pointed out that, neither in principle nor in details, is there anything new in Mr. Lloyd George's schemes. The Labour Party, with a much better prospect of securing a majority than the Liberals, are equally confident that their development schemes, coupled with Nationalisation of various industries and transport services, will secure even more than a mere reduction to normal. They will not be content with anything far short of total abolition.

WHAT IS THE "NATURAL PROCESS"?

What all three Parties and their advisers on economic questions persistently ignore is that the "natural process" referred to by Mr. Baldwin operates not in the direction of removing unemployment, but in the reverse direction. The "natural process" of capitalism is in the direction of greater and greater productivity; more wealth produced by fewer workers; machines replacing men. This is the natural process everywhere at work, and constantly aggravating the problem. Given capitalism, that is the private ownership of the means for producing and distributing wealth, and the continued tendency for that ownership to be concentrated more and more in the hands of the wealthy few, unemployment is not to be solved by any of the familiar devices of increased production, greater efficiency, more exports, or the purchase of home produced goods. The position in the coal mines of this country illustrates the factors at work in every land and throughout industry. Between March, 1928, and March, 1929, coal exports increased, and coal production increased by nearly 500,000 tons a week (nearly 10 per cent.), but the number of miners employed decreased by 20,000 (2 per cent.) (See Board of Trade Journal 28th March).

The wealth of the capitalist world is in the hands of a few. They own the factories, and they alone decide whether and when those factories shall be used for the production of goods. The luxurious living and sheer waste of the capitalists and their Governments are far outstripped by the ever-growing powers of production. Whatever name Liberals or the Labour Party may give to their schemes, they can only keep off the labour market the ever-growing army

of men thrown out of employment through rationalisation, new machinery, etc., by various forms of wasteful expenditure, private and State charity, whether these take the form of relief works, a huge standing Army and Navy, expenditure on wars and battleships, hordes of officials, or unnecessary domestic servants. That is not a solution of the unemployment problem. Unemployment can be removed only by the abolition of capitalism.

UNEMPLOYMENT NOT THE CAUSE OF POVERTY.

There is, however, a more important question. These Parties are all content to fight the election on the issue of unemployment. The Socialist Party alone is not. Poverty is not caused merely by unemployment. The working class in general are poor, in work or out, and in every part of the world where capitalism prevails. When Mr. Baldwin says that the workers enjoy "a higher standard of life than has ever been enjoyed before," he blandly ignores the fact that the workers' standard of life is far below the ordinary standard of the privileged class of non-producers—the capitalist class. They own and control the land, the railways, the factories, mines, ships, and other means of producing and distributing wealth. Out of the whole vast wealth of this country it is estimated by Professor Henry Clay (Liberal) that "it is probably safe to say that over two-thirds of the National capital is held by less than 2 per cent. of the people." ("Times," 24th March, 1925).

The working class are the majority of the population. They produce the wealth and organise industry from top to bottom. They provide the sinews, the muscles and the brains of industry.

The capitalists are the small minority, but they own and control industry. Of the goods produced each year by the working class, Professor Clay states that 94.5 per cent. of the population have only 56 per cent. of the whole annual income. That is to say that nearly half the National income is enjoyed by 5.5 per cent. of the population. (See "Times," March 24th, 1925.)

That is why the workers are poor.

WHAT IS SOCIALISM?

We stand for Socialism, which means the transfer of the means of production from the hands of the few to society as a whole, involving the ending of the whole system based on a class of owners who enjoy but

do not produce, and a class of producers who do not own.

The method of doing this is for the working class majority to understand Socialism, organise in the Socialist Party and vote their delegates into control of the House of Commons. Nothing short of Socialism will abolish working class poverty and unemployment. But Socialism will at the same time solve all the economic problems which are the subject matter of the long and intricate programmes about which these three big parties are disputing.

They fight this and every election on plans to remedy some of the effects of capitalism. The Socialist Party fights for the abolition of capitalism.

ANSWER TO CORRESPONDENT.

WHAT IS WEALTH?

High Wycombe, Bucks.,
8/4/1929.

To the Editor of THE SOCIALIST STANDARD.

Dear Comrade,—It is stated in the Party's Manifesto "That wealth is natural material converted by labour power to man's use." Am I right in assuming that unworked coal mines, undelved copper mines, undug gold mines, the uncaught fish in the sea, corn or cattle that grow wild, or the air we breathe, because they have no labour spent upon them, cannot be termed wealth? On the other hand coal, copper or gold which has been brought to the earth's surface by human hands are wealth; similarly fish that have been netted from rivers or sea, cattle that have been reared, or corn grown by man. Even air, when used for industrial purposes, such as compressed air when used for automatic brakes, lifts, bellows, etc. I should esteem it a personal favour if you would let me know whether these remarks are correct in the columns of your next issue.—Yours truly,
J. E. Roe.

OUR REPLY.

Our correspondent is quite accurate in his statement of the nature of economic wealth and the manner of its production. Everyday experience (as instanced by the illustration our correspondent gives of compressed air) bears out the correctness of the Marxian view of this question.

ED., COMM.

NOTE.

Comrade Mrs. Gostick wishes to thank all those who so kindly assisted at our late Comrade Fitzgerald's funeral, and also the Camberwell and Clerkenwell branches for their wreaths.

TO THE NEW WOMEN VOTERS.

All the newspapers are vying with each other in giving advice to the new women voters.

Each paper is gravely urging the newly-enfranchised to give their vote to the Party it happens to support. Judging by the Liberal, Labour and Tory Press the future prosperity and happiness of this generation and the next is to be settled finally at the forthcoming election.

We want to give some sound advice to the new women voters, and it is the same advice that we have given to all the workers, men and women alike.

We are not going to draw pretty posters of chubby babies, with touching headlines, or any other slushy, sentimental nonsense to tickle their fancy. We want to talk to women as responsible, intelligent people, with the ability to think and judge for themselves. Are you satisfied with conditions to-day? Can you read the newspapers without feeling keenly and bitterly the reports of continual hardships and sufferings endured by our class? Fellow feeling is strong in some of us, and when one reads of a thousand men fighting, yes, literally fighting, to get into a Town Hall where one hundred were to be chosen for a temporary job, and one thinks of nine hundred going wearily home to report no luck to their anxious families, then the chubby faced babies fade from the picture and stern realities take their place.

Think of all the suffering miners and their families without sufficient food or clothing, think of the broken-down aged men and women tramping from one workhouse to another; thrown out on the industrial scrap heap. Think of the one million maimed, many so hideous that they shock their own families, relics of the last war. Think also of those who, not actually wanting food, clothing and shelter, are starved in other ways, yet possessing talents they have no chance of using. Musicians, painters, artists and students of every conceivable subject, all held back by the lack of cash and opportunity to further their studies. Thousands die every year in the hospitals because the cures they need are too expensive. What about your own struggle to make ends meet?

Here now are stern realities, day to day happenings, and we ask you, what are you going to do about it? Not one of the

Parties in Parliament can or will obtain the remedy for these ills. Why? Because the remedy lies in Socialism, and they are opposed to common ownership of the means and instruments for producing the necessities of life. Women have got to understand that political power must first be obtained by a Socialist working class, who then will reorganise society on Socialist principles. The workers will be in possession of the fields, factories and workshops, and production will be for use and not profit. Those fit will work, and working time will be adjusted to the needs of the population. All will be entitled to what they need, providing it can be produced, and at a glance one can see that the economic ills we are suffering from must of necessity disappear.

There is only one organisation in this country which is working for these ends, and that is the S.P.G.B. We do not say "vote for us and we will do it for you." We simply tell you, first understand Socialism and then send your representatives to Parliament to carry out your wishes. Knowing what you want, none could bamboozle you.

This is the advice we given to new women voters, and it is advice that we have given to the workers, both men and women, consistently for twenty-five years.

M. O.


TRAFALGAR SQUARE

A MEETING

WILL BE HELD ON

SUNDAY, JUNE 9th

at 3 p.m.

 Send your TINFOIL to the General Secretary at the Head Office—It will help to Raise Funds.

THE USES OF HATE.

The word hatred describes an emotion with which we are all familiar. Like all such "emotional" words it is habitually overworked, and is used to describe all the variations of dislike, from a mild indignation to a maniac's obsession. A dividing line is difficult, but it should obviously be confined, in human affairs, to describing a dislike that is intense and long continued. Like all emotions, it is ephemeral, unstable, and erratic, and if too intense, or too protracted, either burns itself to ashes or becomes a form of lunacy. That is why it is so completely untrue for the enemies of Socialism to describe it as a doctrine of hatred. We need not, and do not, worry because they say that, for they will continue to use all forms of abuse so long as they are deemed effective. A somewhat different aspect of hatred is given by those—Communists and others—who say we do not infuse enough hatred into the workers; those who view hatred as a formidable social factor; those who contend the working class will be drawn into a revolutionary struggle for power through a growing hatred of their masters. The answer to both criticisms is a brief one. As already stated, hatred is merely a feeling, an intense and prolonged dislike. Action can follow, and often does follow, as a result of the feeling, but as the emotion is an unstable one, the action is more than likely to be equally erratic. Passion may burst a way through a wall, but one cannot build a wall on it. Hatred may be a factor, it cannot be the factor. Socialism has but small use for it. Whilst we depict the cruelties and infamies of capitalism in order to rouse the indignation and fix the attention of our fellows, we should be worse than fools to build a movement on mere indignation.

In our perusal of history, in our observation of the world around us, there is always enough to keep our indignation alive, but we do not peruse history or look at our world for that. We study these things that we may understand how our society has come to be as it is, and how it may be made to serve human happiness more perfectly. We may perceive that malice, ignorance or sheer perversity may have added to human misery or may have diverted the results of communal effort into private channels, but indignation will not remedy it. Neither will action based upon

mere hatred of the human agents involved. Socialism has little use for hatred. We prefer to concentrate on knowledge, for with knowledge comes understanding, and from understanding proceeds intelligent, definite action. This is one great difference between the Socialist Party and the Labour Party. The latter—and this is not a mere jibe—specialises in sob-stuff. Its Press and its political representatives are absorbed in the appeal to sentiment. They appeal constantly for your tears for the orphan, the underfed, the widow, the aged, the out-of-work, the casual labourer, the poorly housed, the "ex-Service man," and dozens of other categories of poverty. And being a mere sentimental appeal, and further, being without the correct knowledge and understanding, they invite you to get the Government to give a pension to this one, increase the pension to that one, feed the children of the other one, and so on. They assure you that this kind of thing is "practical Socialism," and implore you to give them the keys of power so that they may dispense the appropriate plaster for each social sore. The appeal is purely sentimental; a fatal basis upon which to build an effective party. People may respond more quickly to an appeal to their feelings, rather than their reason, but, action based upon reason will go further, make fewer mistakes and get there, long before sentimentalism has exhausted all the possibilities of error. Perhaps a couple of recent examples will illustrate the point. Lansbury is an incorrigible sentimentalist. He is one of those many critics of our Party who say: "Yes, the object of your organisation is quite good, but it is useless to oppressed and starving men. What we want is something practical: something now." He is one of those who have alternatively called forth the workers' anger against their oppressors, whilst addressing heart-stirring appeals to the oppressors to be just, charitable, equitable and what not. In our twenty-five years of existence we have consistently demonstrated the utter futility of the "something now" policy, and the rank and dangerous absurdity of the mere appeal to righteous indignation. In the "New Leader" of April 19th, Lansbury writes:—"Small measures of reform are of no use. Tories and Liberals will all the time outbid us on them. We have reached the end of our journey along what might be described as the Palliative Highway."

What a pity it should have taken him half a lifetime to learn what we have been saying for a quarter of a century. We wish we could think he meant what he was saying. And then there is A. J. Cook, another sentimentalist. Full of appeals to feeling, to hatred, to indignation and anger. According to the "Sunday Worker," April 21st, he is alleged to have said in 1926: "If ever you read of me dining with Royalty, you workers can say Cook has deserted you." And yet in 1929, only the other day, Mr. Cook is lunching with the Prince of Wales. Dearie me! More apropos of the point under discussion, he contributed an article to the "Evening Standard" of April 20th, bulging with the most sentimental, inept twaddle that journal has published for some time. It was called "The Prince of Wales." Apart from its rather fulsome eulogy of the Prince as an individual (quite possibly true) phrases like the following occur. "I never met a man with such a rigid conception of fair play." He has been "a good democrat." "When the Prince went to Durham he was horrified. He said so; and when he told what he had found, he cut clean through old controversy—economic and every other kind." "That man had no use for pomp and formulæ. He was not concerned with theory. It was, it is, men, not manners, that concern him; conditions, not conventionality."

These are a few of them. And what do they all mean? How far do they take us? What problem is solved? None! For none is stated. We are even told that the sound of the Prince's voice over the wireless, reduced him to tears and caused him to empty his pockets for the Miners' Fund. That is the worst of emotion; its victims alternate between raving hatred and slobbering affection. Their only stability is a pause between absurdities. Cook records in the article that a woman, also listening to the Prince's wireless appeal, cried out wonderingly, "Why, Arthur, it might have been you or Bob Smillie appealing."

When Cook has dried his eyes, perhaps he will take another look at that remark. Just as Lansbury has found out that Tories and Liberals can outbid Labour on palliatives, so Cook should reflect that the Prince of Wales can do what he and Smillie are doing, quite as effectively, possibly more elegantly, and certainly with no more danger to Capitalism. To return to the heading of this article. Hatred, anger, in-

dignation, are not enough. Socialism is a practical, scientific proposition, to be applied to existing society. It will not be brought into operation by angry men, for anger is a bad counsellor. Socialism will be resisted, even when economic necessity has made it imminent, by desperate, powerful interests, and those who would lead the workers against those forces armed with nothing but indignation and a sense of wrong, are criminal lunatics. Hate is ephemeral, knowledge eternal. Anger is warping, science is certain. He who feels is the creature of his feelings. He who knows is superior to them.

W. T. H.

RECEIVED FOR REVIEW.

Selections from Lenin. Vol 1. (wrappers)	2/6
Azure Cities—Stories of New Russia, by various Russian Authors	7/6
Heading for War, by T. Bell. (wrappers)	1/-
Revolutionary Essays, by Lenin (..)	1/-
Marxism, by Lenin (..)	1/-
Illustrated History of Russian Revolution Vol. 2. (Cloth)	15/-
All above works are published by Martin Lawrence 26, Bedford Row, W.C.	

ISLINGTON.

LECTURES

will be given at

CO-OPERATIVE HALL,
144, SEVEN SISTERS ROAD, N.7,
(Entrance Thane Villas)

WEDNESDAY, MAY 8th, at 8 o'clock.

W. E. BROWN,

"THE FUTILITY OF REFORM"

ALSO

WEDNESDAY, MAY 22nd, at 8 o'clock.

W. E. McHAFFIE,

"ELECTION ISSUES"

Admission Free.

Questions and Discussion.

Contributions are earnestly invited to assist us with the expense of publishing more literature.

OFFICIAL NOTICE.

All communications for the Executive Committee, Subscriptions for the **SOCIALIST STANDARD**, Articles, and Correspondence submitted for insertion therein, should be addressed—The Socialist Party of Great Britain, 17, Mount Pleasant, London, W.C.1, to whom Money Orders should be made payable.

The meetings of the Executive Committee are held at the Head Office, every Tuesday, at 7.30 p.m.

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTIONS.

Twelve Months, post free... .. 2s. 6d.
Six Months, post free... .. 1s. 8d.

The Socialist Standard,

MAY,



1929

THE DEATH OF COMRADE JACK FITZGERALD.

We regret to announce the sad news that Comrade J. Fitzgerald passed away, following a serious operation, in St. Peter's Hospital, Covent Garden, on Tuesday, April 16th, at seven o'clock in the morning.

Comrade Fitzgerald was a part of the Socialist movement, and his death is like the tearing away of a limb. He died at the comparatively early age of 57, and from his youth to his dying day he took his place in the front rank of the fighters for Socialism.

To those who have only known him in his later years a little of his early history may be interesting.

A bricklayer by trade, he took an active part in the Operative Bricklayers' Union, was at one time on their Executive Committee, and on at least two occasions acted as one of their delegates to the Trades Union Congress.

He joined the Social Democratic Federation (afterwards the Social Democratic Party) in the 'nineties, and attended some of the classes run by Edward Aveling, the son-in-law of Karl Marx. Along with a few others he fought against the Reformist tendencies inside the S.D.F., and sought to convert that body into a fitting instrument

for the inauguration of Socialism. He urged the formation of economics and other classes to further the education of the workers, but was jeered at by the official group, who tried to silence him by the charge of "impossibilism." He, and the group that was with him, were confronted by a solid wall of opposition, which was the more difficult to get over because the officials held the strings, and meetings were closed to the unauthorised. The S.D.F. was committed to a policy of compromise and also to reformist activity through the association of its prominent members with reactionary trades unionism and with the Twentieth Century Press, many of whose shareholders were outside the ranks of the working class and out of sympathy with the Socialist movement.

Matters came to a head at the Burnley Conference of the S.D.F. in 1904, when Fitzgerald and another member were expelled, by means of a trick, on general charges that were shown to exist only in the imagination of prominent members of the S.D.F. of the time.

The general dissatisfaction with the reactionary policy of the Social Democratic Federation led to the secession of a number of its members, who, together with some others, formed the Socialist Party of Great Britain on the 12th June, 1904. Fitzgerald took a leading part with these in hammering out the policy of the Party, a policy that has withstood the fierce assaults of all opposition for twenty-five years.

He was a member of the first Executive Committee of the Party, and since that day, with short lapses, of late on account of illness, he has always figured on that body. He was a first-class speaker, writer and debater, as the columns of the "Standard" through the years bear eloquent testimony. Two of his debates with Liberal and Tory have appeared in pamphlet form, and are as fresh to-day in principle and policy as if they had only occurred yesterday. In the view of those who were present the finest debate was many years ago with Lawler Wilson, the best debater the anti-Socialist Union ever had. The calibre of his opponent made such an impression on Lawler Wilson that, subsequently, in a book entitled "The Menace of Socialism," and published in 1909, he wrote of the Party:—

The Socialist Party of Great Britain, a young organisation and an offshoot from the Social

Democratic Party, is spreading about London and challenging the older organisations in such districts as Battersea and Tottenham. The members are Marxians and Revolutionaries, preaching the Class War. The catechumens of the party are put through a rigid course of training in the principles of their creed, which they must be prepared to defend at the risk of their liberty. What is most remarkable and disquieting about this dangerous organisation is the fact that the members are unquestionably higher-grade working-men of great intelligence, respectability and energy. They are, as a whole, the best-informed Socialists in the country, and would make incomparable soldiers, or desperate barricaders. As revolutionaries, they deserve no mercy: as men they command respect.

It is difficult for those who have not come into close touch with all phases of the internal work of the Party to realise the tremendous industry of Fitzgerald, his accuracy and comprehensiveness, and the energy and thoroughness with which he tackled every job that came his way, and no "donkey work" was shirked by him. Whether it was folding "Standards" in days gone by, selling them, preparing for street corner meetings, or helping a fellow worker to unravel the intricacies of some form of knowledge, it was always the same; he was ready, willing and anxious to give a hand.

On the Editorial Committee he toiled for years, giving the best that was in him, and often only finishing preparing matter for the printer long after the midnight hour had struck.

All his life he has worked hard to spread among his fellow workers a knowledge of the principles formulated by Karl Marx, and which are the foundations of the scientific Socialist Movement. It is, therefore, fitting that his last published writing was a Review in the March "S.S." of a new translation of Marx's great work, "Capital." To do this review Fitzgerald read through again, and compared carefully the older and the new translations, and he did this while sinking under the effects of his illness. He received the book about the end of November, and was operated on twice before he finished the review.

If anyone desires to gauge Fitzgerald's consistency let them glance at the first page of the first number of the "Socialist Standard" for September, 1904, and the advertisement of the Economics Class, and then, in the next number the article on taxation. Then let them turn to his last few articles

and the Review in the March number. There is a quarter of a century of ceaseless activity between the two periods, but the position outlined is the same. That was Fitzgerald: fearless, sturdy, consistent and solid as a rock, a fitting instrument to be used by the workers in the struggle for emancipation.

We are not hero-worshippers, and we are keenly conscious of human frailty. Fulsome flattery and empty phrases are not our way, but we know how to estimate the worth of a man. No man worked harder than Fitzgerald to dispel the illusions of the "Great Man" theory and to impress upon his fellows that they must depend on themselves and acquire the necessary knowledge if they would free themselves from bondage; that, in the words of Marx, "the emancipation of the working class must be the work of the working class itself."

Fitzgerald was by nature a teacher in the best sense of the word, an imparter of knowledge. In an educational direction, quite outside the Party, he inspired respect for his work. For the past sixteen years he was on the teaching staff of the London County Council School of Building in Brixton. When they heard of his death they sent the following resolution to one of his friends:—

"We, the members of the full-time staff of the School of Building, learn with deep regret of the death of our colleague and friend, Mr. J. Fitzgerald.

"We desire to place on record our appreciation of his able, conscientious and untiring services to this school during a period of over 16 years. We feel that his loss to the school is a heavy one, but we are glad to record that his work has resulted in substantial progress and paved the way for further developments in Building Education.

"We further desire to convey our sincere sympathy to his relatives and close friends."

The future will show the fruit of the work of Fitzgerald and others like him, and when posterity comes to reckon its debt to the forerunners who worked so hard for Socialism we can rest assured that Fitzgerald will not be forgotten. His comrades who have fought beside him, and drawn wisdom and aid from him, will carry his memory with them always.

The best tribute we can pay to him is

to emulate his unfailing energy, industry and enthusiasm, and profit by the spade work of him and his fellows to give greater impetus to the movement towards the final extinction of wage slavery.

Those who have worked with him for

years know his value, and the keenness, penetration, and power of the brain that is gone.

The working class movement is poorer today by the loss of one of its worthiest champions.

The Communist Party and the General Election.

As usual, the Communist Party is trying to run with the hare and hunt with the hounds. Since its formation it has repeatedly denounced the Labour Party leaders and programmes, and at the same time, in obedience to its Russian paymasters, has alternately supported and opposed Labour Party candidates. In 1921 it ran a candidate at Caerphilly against the Labour Party candidate, and opposed MacDonald at Woolwich. At the 1922 election it first put forward candidates in opposition to Labour Party candidates; then withdrew them at the last moment and told the workers to vote "Labour." That year at Gorton Mr. Harry Pollitt was put forward as Communist candidate against Mr. John Hodge. Mr. Pollitt denounced the Labour candidate and his programme, but in due course he withdrew and "held large and successful meetings in the constituency, urging the workers to vote for Mr. Hodge." (See the "Communist Daily," November 13, 1922).

In their official Election Manifesto this year ("Class against Class") they admit that their attitude has again changed.

Prior to the formation of the Labour Government in 1924, the Communist Party, although the leaders of the Labour Party were as treacherous then as now, advised the working class to push the Labour Party into power. . . (page 9).

Now, although they describe the Labour Party as "the third Capitalist Party" (p. 8) and say "no Party can serve two masters" (p. 7) they have already declared their willingness to support that Party, i.e., to serve two masters.

In a statement issued to the Press on April 13th of this year, the Political Bureau of the Communist Party made the following declaration ("Sunday Worker," April 14th).

A Labour Government at the present day would be a Government of capitalist rationalisation, only differing from the Tory and Liberal Parties as to the best methods whereby rationali-

sation could be brought about at the expense of the workers.

It is, therefore, no longer possible for the Communist Party to advise the workers to give unconditional support to Labour candidates, even in constituencies not being contested by the Communists.

The Communist Party is advising the workers only to vote for such Labour candidates as are prepared to accept a policy of minimum working class demands, involving the repudiation of Mondism, of imperialism, and of the policy of trade union disruption now being actively operated in the trade union movement.

Unless these demands are accepted the Communist Party will advise the workers to refrain from voting.

The policy of asking a Labour candidate to endorse "a policy of minimum working class demands, etc.," as a condition of giving him their vote is a piece of the pettiest election trickery. If the candidate wants their votes and chooses to give a pledge in order to get them, he can do so without the least danger of ever being compelled to carry out the pledge. The pledge itself in its terms is so general as to be largely meaningless.

But to see how dishonest or foolish the Communist Party is we need only consider the result of their applying a similar face-saving expedient in earlier contests.

This same policy was applied at the 1922 General Election. When Mr. Pollitt withdrew from the contest at Gorton, the Openshaw Branch of the Communist Party put a series of questions on unemployment to Mr. John Hodge in order to decide whether or not they could support him. The official organ of the Communist Party ("Communist Daily," 13th November, 1922) reported that "It is not clear from the Labour candidate's reply whether he agrees with this point in the Communist Party's programme or not." Nevertheless they supported him.

In other words, their attempt to excuse their support of Hodge and their betrayal of the workers by seeking a pledge from him broke down because he did not want their support and refused to give the pledge.

They had then, as now, to act not in accordance with some settled principles but as Moscow may from time to time dictate.

And even where they did endorse some Labour M.P.'s who were willing at the time to accept their support, the result has clearly shown how little control they have over the men in question. After the 1923 election Mr. Tom Bell, Editor of the "Communist Review" (January, 1924) stated that the Labour M.P.'s on whom would fall the task of maintaining "the proletarian opposition" to the leaders of the Labour Party, were "Wheatley, Maxton, Johnston, Kirkwood," and others unnamed. Every one of these four stalwarts they have since roundly denounced as "traitors to the working class."

THE COMMUNIST PARTY A REFORM PARTY.

Knowing full well that in spite of their liberal supplies of money they do not stand any chance whatever of getting a candidate returned by Communist votes on a Communist programme, their Election address consists largely of a long list of reforms. Under the title "Our Immediate Programme of Action" the number of reforms listed is no fewer than 94, in addition to a large number of other reforms included in its "Programme of the Revolutionary Workers' Government."

Among the "revolutionary" demands in the list of 94 are such ancient and (to the workers) useless Liberal panaceas as the "abolition of all indirect taxes" (p. 30). As they know full well, cheapening the cost of living is reflected automatically in a lowered cost of living bonus throughout the Civil Service and the Municipal services, and in many other industries, and is rapidly followed by lowered wages throughout the country generally. The great fall in prices since 1920 has brought no improvement in the condition of the workers.

Other reforms, such as "non-contributory pensions at 60," are the common stock-in-trade of all the Parties advocating the reform of Capitalism.

It is amusing to notice that the Communist Party has now been outbitten by its reformist rivals in the I.L.P. For while the I.L.P. is proposing that the unemployed be given pay equal to that of an employed man, the Communists are more moderately asking for only 30s. (p. 21).

This also represents a very big decrease on the claim made by the Communist Party at the 1923 General Election. At that time

they were demanding "£4 a week for all . . . employed and unemployed." (See "Workers' Weekly," 30th November, 1923). They are also supporting the demand for children's allowances (p. 24), a reform which has the backing of prominent members of each of the Parties—Liberal, Tory, Labour, and I.L.P.—and has been applied by numerous Capitalist Governments.

THE POLICY OF ARMED REVOLT.

Lastly, the Communists are repeating their dangerous nonsense about the armed overthrow of the Capitalist State. They say (p. 5) the Communist Party recognises

that the working-class can only conquer capitalism and become the ruling class by the creation of its own instruments of power (i.e., workers' councils, composed of delegates from the factories and the mass organisation of the workers), and the impossibility of the working class capturing and utilising the capitalist State apparatus for the exercise of its own class powers for the building of Socialism.

They say further

. . . . It is only possible to conquer this class domination when . . . the majority of the workers are prepared forcibly to throw off the capitalist class control. . . .

This policy of unarmed workers attempting the forcible overthrow of the capitalist state with its armies, navies and other organised forces of destruction, would lead only to the slaughter of thousands of helpless communist dupes.

The simple truth, here ignored by the Communists, is that it is not only the capitalist minority, but the working-class majority which keeps Communists out of the House of Commons unless they creep in under false pretences. It is useless, they say, for the workers to try to capture and utilise Parliament. But so anxious are they to get inside this institution, which they say is useless, that, rather than fight and lose elections as Communists, they descend to the electioneering devices of the other vote-catching parties and fight the election on this programme of capitalist reforms.

Control of Parliament by persons returned on such a programme and by the kind of votes which such a programme will receive, is indeed useless for the purpose of achieving Socialism. Socialism, as a system of society, cannot be carried on, nor can power for Socialism be obtained without first securing a Socialist majority. The Communist short and crooked cuts lead not to Socialism, but to disillusion and despair.

H.

THE I.L.P. AND THE ELECTION.

In the "New Leader" (26th April, 1929) the Chairman of the I.L.P., Mr. James Maxton, M.P., issues a special appeal for funds in order that the I.L.P. may play its part "in the achievement of Socialism." Surrounding the appeal are the photographs of some of the I.L.P. candidates, one of them being Miss Jennie Lee, who was recently elected as Labour M.P. for North Lanark. She was the I.L.P. nominee, and was financed by the I.L.P. It is interesting, therefore, to notice that she played her part "in the achievement of Socialism," by standing for election on a Programme which contains no reference, direct or indirect, to Socialism. It does not mention the word Socialism, and does not contain any reference to the I.L.P.'s latest programme—"Socialism in our Time." It does not mention the I.L.P. nor Miss Lee's membership of that body, and this in spite of the fact that they financed her and were responsible for her candidature. Like every other member of the I.L.P. who succeeds in getting into Parliament, as Labour M.P. Miss Lee was prevented by the Labour Party from running as a Socialist candidate, even if she wished to do so. She was compelled to stand as Labour candidate on a programme of reforms acceptable to the Labour Party, a party of which Mr. Maxton wrote only last year that its programme "must be regarded not as a Socialist programme but an enlightened Liberal programme." (See one case by A. J. Cook and J. Maxton, M.P. Page 11). Mr. Maxton added:—

If every measure in the Labour Party Programme was carried, then we would not have Socialism, but rationalised capitalism. (Ibid, p. 17).

Thus does the I.L.P. win illusory "victories" for "Socialism."

The reason is obvious, and was frankly admitted by Dr. Alfred Salter, member of the I.L.P. and Labour M.P. for Bermondsey, in a letter to the "New Leader" (12th October, 1928). He said:—

There is not a single constituency in the country where there is a majority of convinced Socialist electors. We have plenty of districts, such as Bermondsey, where there is an overwhelming Labour majority, but it is a sheer delusion to think that the greater number of these people understand what we mean by Socialism. They neither understand it nor want it.

The only way to secure the return of Socialist candidates on a Socialist pro-

gramme is to win the working class over to Socialism. Instead of doing this the I.L.P. devotes its resources to the preaching of reforms and deludes itself that it is "achieving Socialism" by securing the return of Labour M.P.'s on the votes of non-Socialists. Only the Socialist Party devotes its energies to the propagation of Socialist principles, and refrains from securing Parliamentary seats under false pretences.

H.

AN ACTIVE WORKER FOR SOCIALISM.

THE PASSING OF COMRADE S. AUTY.

We regret to announce the death of Comrade S. Auty, of Tottenham, on March 23rd, at the age of 46. He had been ill over a period of many years, but his untiring work for Socialism brought the end much closer than if he had been able to seek rest and attention in time. He was one of the very early members of the Party, having joined in 1904.

He was many years on the Executive and, in spite of poor health, was evident at most of the propaganda meetings in an active capacity. Comrades of the old Edmonton Branch, of which Auty was Secretary, knew him as one of the most earnest and devoted members the Party ever had.

Comrade Lake represented the Party at the funeral, and paid a tribute to his life and work.

Our sincere sympathy is offered to his wife and family in the loss of such a sterling comrade.

OUR FIRST PROSPECTIVE CANDIDATE FOR PARLIAMENT

At a meeting of the Battersea Branch, Comrade Barker, of the Tooting Branch, was adopted as prospective candidate of the Socialist Party of Great Britain for Battersea.

It now remains for those who desire to see our candidate go to the polls to give practical effect to their wishes by swelling the Parliamentary Fund to the required dimensions.

As we pointed out originally, our candidates will go to the polls if we are provided with sufficient funds to carry the business through.

SOME QUESTIONS ON OUR POLICY.

AN ANSWER TO A CORRESPONDENT.

A correspondent, A. J. Cave (Hornsey Rise), asks three questions:—

Question I.—In the event of your Party obtaining a majority on any Municipal Council what is your policy?

Answer.—As our candidates run only on a Socialist programme, not a programme of reforms, their election would pre-suppose the existence of an electorate, the majority of whom were Socialists fully aware of the limited uses of local Councils while the central machinery of Government remains in the hands of the Capitalist class. They would use that limited power on behalf of the workers as occasion permitted, and would naturally take advantage of their position for propaganda purposes, pointing out, as always, the need for control of the political machinery, National and local. It may also be pointed out that the election of a Socialist majority in one area would obviously also pre-suppose the close approach to a majority generally in areas with a majority of working class voters.

Question II.—Do you run candidates for propaganda purposes only?

Answer.—If our correspondent will refer to our Declaration of Principles (in this and every number of the S.S.) he will see that our object in running candidates at elections (Parliament and local Councils) is to achieve "the conquest of the powers of Government, National and local," in order that the machinery of Government, "including the armed forces," may be used for the purpose of establishing Socialism.

Question III.—Can a Christian be a Socialist or a Socialist be a Christian? (I claim to be a free non-orthodox Christian).

Answer.—Unless our correspondent is using the term "Christian" in other than the accepted sense, the answer to both questions is No!

We cannot do better than refer him to our pamphlet, "Socialism and Religion," which deals exhaustively with the whole question.

ED. COMM.

NEW PREMISES.

It has now been arranged that we shall enter our new premises about the middle of May—42, GREAT DOVER STREET, S.E.1., close to Borough (Underground) Station.

SOCIALIST BREVITIES.

THE GATE TO MORE.

You all know, of course, that Unemployment can be both nice and nasty—the degrees of niceness and nastiness depending entirely upon the quality of wisdom displayed in choosing one's parents. Locker-Lampson, Fat-free Smith, Lloyd George, etc., etc., suffer their pangs amidst the lush verdure of the Riviera, but we workers prefer to cultivate our faculties of observation by meandering around looking for the display of that soul-stirring caption—"Hands wanted"! (Of course, if you are a baker, you may be expected to use your feet!)

However, let us look at unemployment as known to, and regarded as a normal risk by, the workers. Labour "leaders," "economists," and "captains of industry," have constantly asserted that the cure for this disease is "More production," "Rationalisation" or "Nationalisation"—all fancied names for the increased exploitation of the workers. "Look at America!" they say. But let us look at England first. Lord Ebbisham, the President of the Federation of British Industries, in an article in the "Morning Post" (14/1/29), surveying British industrial conditions during 1928, makes the following statement:—

Lastly, the reliability of unemployment returns as an index to industrial activity has been affected by the economy of effort and labour, which is one of the outstanding features of post-war industrial reorganisation. There is little doubt that post-war methods of manufacture aim at increasing output while actually decreasing the number of men engaged in production. That most of the workers so displaced will find employment in new industries does not minimise the significance of the possibility that, if the present tendency continues manufacturing, as opposed to marketing, finance, and other commercial activities, will in the future make progressively decreasing demands on the population, and in that sense will play a smaller part as a contributor to the general prosperity. (Our Italics.)

More production, more—unemployment!

Observe that manufacturing (i.e., wealth production) will continue to make lesser and lesser "demand on the population." A very generous interpretation of the 1921 Census returns gives us 7,615,198 workers engaged in productive occupations out of a population of about 45,000,000 (see pamphlet "Socialism," pages 9 and 10), so the workers should feel quite complacent as to

their prospects of increased leisure in the future.

But apparently, marketing, finance, etc., will make more and more "demands on the population." Perhaps. Let us see. The "Morning Post" (1/1/29) provides us with a nice little tit-bit:—

ROBOT BANK CLERKS.

Will there be fewer openings for junior clerks in our large banks, owing to the ever-increasing efficiency of the ledger-posting, exchange-reckoning automatic devices being introduced? One of the latest of these devices is an American ledger-posting machine which writes out customers' bank balances in their pass-books and posts the amount of credit and debit.

Under the new system a girl can do the work of two or three men. One of the largest London Banks is doing all its complicated exchange conversions by machine, and all foreign currencies can be turned into pounds sterling by turning a handle. A British machine for ledger-posting is being used at Lloyds' head office, and nearly all bank branches are saving hours every week by up-to-date machines.

One need not be a prophet to see what this state of affairs might lead to in the future. I will hazard a guess, anyhow!

Scene: A big Stores in 19—?

Salesman (to customer): "Bank clerks, Sir? Yessir! Fine line in to-day, sir. Six for sixpence each, sir. Or thirteen for a shilling if you are not superstitious, sir. Four gross, sir? Thank you, sir. They will be delivered to-morrow, sir, 12.30 p.m., in one of our plain vans, together with our free insurance policy. Good-day, sir."

Ah! But engineering will always be safe for the workers. Munitions, ships and things. Do not, therefore, let the following paragraph, culled from the "Manchester Guardian" (14/1/29) disquiet you unduly:

Mr. James Rowan, general secretary of the Electrical Trades Union, in his monthly report to the members, writes that the most remarkable feature of the past year has been the heavy production on the one hand in most of the staple industries, and on the other the large percentage of unemployment in the same industries. Shipbuilding in 1928 produced a tonnage in excess of all previous years, except 1922, yet so great has been the progress of labour-saving devices that the percentage of unemployed in shipbuilding districts never seems to have gone below 10 per cent., and in many cases had reached 20 per cent., and even 25 per cent.

In the engineering section much the same state of things has prevailed. The motor section had a great year, and certainly there was a boom in electrical engineering.

Noting this, and while again noting there has been a record output both in volume and value, the percentage of engineers unemployed has been remarkably high. In all the productive sections of industry the same remarks

apply. To think that at the end of a year of such enhanced production it should leave us with about two millions of the workable population redundant, is something that casts a very grave reflection on the powers that be. If this is the result of rationalisation, so far as it has gone, then it seems rationalisation has gone mad.

Engine-very-neers!

HAPPY ERIN.

Now how can poverty be cured before the cause is discovered? There are too many of us, that's the true cause. Not enough jobs to go round, obviously. At least, that is what the Labour "leaders," "economists" and "statesmen" tell us—and they ought to know! The population of Ireland has been declining for centuries, so we will doubtless find here a happy, prosperous and healthy people. Especially now they have "Home Rule." You will see this is so by the paragraph below, taken from an article on "Progress under Home Rule" by the "Morning Post" special correspondent (31/12/28).

I do not suppose anybody will contradict my statement that the Government till is empty, or that the farmers are in a deplorable state. Mr. Cassidy, Labour Member for Donegal, made this remarkable statement in the "Dail" some weeks ago: "Unemployment and destitution prevail, thousands of farmers are in the state of poverty, thousands of fishermen are destitute, and nothing is being done for them. I think it is indeed strange that the Government should have given a thousand pounds to the Royal Zoological Society for the keep of wild animals while at the same time they refuse to keep human beings in the country."

Oh! dash it all. I've given the wrong paragraph!

HE CHANGETH NOT.

What we want is "leaders." Leaders who will lead! Sincere, honest, champions of the worker's cause. Bromley, Cramp, Smillie, Newbold: all of these used to fill the bill. Even Trotsky is more than doubtful just now! But A. J. Cook is the man. He is the one pearl in the ointment, the true gilt on the cokerhut.

'Erb Smith? N.G. Cook? The Miners' Messiah, the workers' Whatname! Leaders may come, leaders may go; but Cook remains, with a tow-row-row! Cook the—but what's this little bit in the "Sunday Worker" for March 10th? Can it be? The great A.J.? I'm afraid it can!

In his weekly article in that newspaper, this paragon, so well boosted by the Com-

munists, seems to have followed his late partner, Maxton, and crumpled up entirely under the threat of the Labour mandarins. Here is a piquant extract:—

A Labour Government would bring new life and hope to the workers, would increase faith in trade unionism, and thus would lead us nearer to Socialism. Therefore I regret the actions of any party or sections that start new unions, or that endanger the return of a Labour Government. This is my view after an active life of many years in the Trade Union and Socialist Movement. No doubt I shall be called reactionary, a compromiser, etc., etc., by the Communists in particular. I want every reader to become an active Trade Unionist, and control his own destiny, believing Socialism is our only hope.

You see, you get nearer Socialism, the only hope, by supporting Capitalism.

ANOTHER WRECK!

In the same issue of the "Sunday Worker" there is another interesting item, which, by the way, may have some bearing on the defection of A. J. Cook:—

The National Left Wing Committee meeting, held in London last week-end, decided by ten votes to one that the Left Wing Movement as a national organisation should be dissolved. It was emphasised that this decision does not mean the cessation of Local Left Wing activities, which should continue on the basis of local united front committees and workers' electoral committees, their work based on concrete issues before the workers. The decision was made after thorough and frank discussion, in which two points were strongly urged as making continuance of the organisation impossible.

The first point was that the Birmingham conference political and organisational decisions have made it hopeless to turn the Labour Party into a working-class party. The "loyalty" resolution now makes Left Wing work in the Labour Party impossible.

The second point emphasised was that the continuation of the National Left Wing movement in its present form involves the danger of a new Party which would be detrimental to the interests of the working class. The resolution adopted advised all Left Wing workers who desire to carry on a fight for Socialism that they can best do so by joining the Communist Party, now fighting alone for full emancipation of the workers.

Have you seen any of these "full emancipation" programmes of the Communist Party? Their slogans, too, are quite good—"God save the People" is the very latest, I believe!

YOUR Newsagent can obtain this journal from Wholesale Agents: W. H. Smith & Son, Strand House, W.C.

GEORGE MOORE ON CHARITY-MONGERING.

"... A case of intense suffering is brought under the notice of a bourgeois; it awakens in him a certain hysterical pity, or, should I say, remorse, for he feels that a system that permits such things to be cannot be wholly right. He relieves this suffering, and then he thinks he is a virtuous man; he thinks he has done a good action; but a moment's reflection shows us that this good action is only selfishness in disguise—that it is nothing more than a personal gratification, a balm to his wound, which, by a sort of reflective action, he has received from outraged humanity. Charity is of no use; it is individual, and nothing individual is of any value; the movement must be general."

GEORGE MOORE.

ANSWERS TO CORRESPONDENTS.

C. McLean (Burnley).

Neither Marx nor Engels dealt in detail with the mental process. Dietzgen deals with the thinking process in his works, but not specifically with the "slowness" of the worker's mind to grasp the necessity of Social Revolution.

This is a matter dealt with often in the Socialist Standard.

J. Blundell (Burton).

Soddy's Cartesian Economics may be cartesian, but it is not economics. The professor may know physics, but he is certainly unacquainted with Economic Science. We will try and review his pamphlet shortly.

S.P.G.B. PROPAGANDA MEETINGS

LONDON DISTRICT.

- | | |
|-----------------------|--|
| Sundays ... | Clapham Common, 3 p.m.
Tottenham, West Green Corner, 11.30 a.m.
Tooting, Garrett Lane, Tooting Broadway, 7.30 p.m.
Victoria Park, 4 p.m.
Woolwich, Beresford Square, 7.30 p.m.
Hyde Park, 11.30 a.m.
Paddington, Prince of Wales, 8 p.m. |
| Mondays ... | Paddington, Prince of Wales, 8 p.m.
Clerkenwell, Garnault Place, 8 p.m. |
| Wednesdays ... | Forest Gate Station, 8 p.m.
Paddington, Prince of Wales, 8 p.m. |
| Thursdays ... | Becontree, Rodney Street, Ilford, 8 p.m. |
| Fridays ... | Clerkenwell, Acton St., Grays Inn Rd., 8 p.m.
Hackney, Paragon Road and Mare Street, 8 p.m. |
| Saturdays ... | Wood Green, Jolly Butchers Hill, 8 p.m.
Leyton, Corner Grange Park, 7.30 p.m. |
| HANLEY BRANCH. | |
| Sundays ... | Hanley Market Square, 7 p.m.
Burslem, St. John Square, 7 p.m. |

BRANCH DIRECTORY.

- BATTERSEA.**—Sec., 2, Hanbury-road, S.W.11. Branch meets Thursday, 8.30 p.m. at The Waiting Room, Latchmere Baths, entrance in Burns-road. Discussion second Thurs. in month.
- BECONTREE.**—Sec., Hy. Gratton, 4, Drummond Ave., Brooklands, Romford. Branch meets 1st and 3rd Wednesdays at 7.30, at above address.
- BIRMINGHAM.**—Sec. E. Jesper, 38, Rollason-rd., Erdington. Branch meets The Continental Café, Moor St., 1st and 3rd Sundays at 11 a.m.
- CAMBERWELL.**—Branch meets at Camberwell Trades Council Room, 6A, Artichoke Place, Camberwell Green, every Friday at 8.30 p.m. Discussions—public invited. Letters to Secretary at above address.
- CENTRAL.**—Membership obtained only through the Ex. Committee. Applications to General Sec.
- CLERKENWELL.**—Branch meets Wednesdays, 8 p.m., at 17, Mount Pleasant, W.C.1. Discussions first Wednesday in month at 8 p.m.—all invited. Sec., at above address.
- EAST LONDON.**—Sec., D. Jacobs, 28, Lyal Road, Bow, E.3. Branch meets 1st and 3rd Mondays at 8 p.m. at Stewart's Cafe, 195, Cambridge Rd., E.2.
- GLASGOW.**—Sec. J. C. Walker, 43, Glamis Rd., E.
- HACKNEY.**—Branch meets Arcadian Cafe, 42, Amherst Road, Hackney, Mondays, 8 p.m., Discussions 9.30. Communication to Sec. as above.
- HANLEY.**—Branch meets Tuesdays, Working Men's Club, Glass-st. Sec., F. Goldstraw, 38, Paddock Street, Hanley.
- ISLINGTON.**—Branch meets Wednesdays, 8.30, at 144, Seven Sister-rd., Holloway, N. Sec., A. Gregory, 24, Gooding-rd., N.7.
- LEYTON.**—Sec., 396, Lea Bridge-rd., Leyton. Branch meets 8 p.m., Trades and Labour Hall, Grove House, High-rd., second Mondays in month.
- MANCHESTER.**—Sec., W. Addison, 111, West Park-street, Salford, Manchester.—Branch meets 1st and 3rd Thursdays in month, 7.45 p.m.
- PADDINGTON.**—Branch meeting held on 2nd and 4th Fridays, 8 p.m., in room above the Co-operative Stores, 308, Kilburn-lane, W.9 (side door).
- SOUTHEND-ON-SEA.**—Sec., J. Bird, 5 Wellington-avenue, Westcliffe-on-Sea.
- TOOTING.**—Sec., 15, University-road, Collier's Wood, S.W. 19. Branch meets every Friday at 8 p.m. at Tooting Adult School, 971, Garratt-lane, S.W. 17.
- TOTTENHAM.**—Secretary, 18, Woodlands Park Rd., N.15. Branch meets Fridays, Room 2, Trades Hall, 7, Bruce Grove. Discussion after branch business. Public invited.
- WALTHAMSTOW.**—Sec., S. E. Williams, 64, Bloxham-rd., Leyton, E.10. Branch meets at Workmen's Hall, High-st., every Monday.
- WATFORD.**—A. Lawson, Sec., 107 Kensington-avenue, Watford. Branch meets Mondays at 8.30 p.m. at Secretary's address.

- WEST HAM.**—Branch meets Thursdays at 8 p.m. at 167 Romford-rd., Stratford. Sec., P. Hallard, 22, Colegrave-rd., Stratford, E.
- WOOD GREEN.**—All communications to Sec., F. W. Godfrey, 71, Falkland Road, N.8.
- WOOLWICH.**—Branch meets at 94, Griffin Road, Plumstead. Communications to Secretary at above address.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY

OF GREAT BRITAIN.

OBJECT.—The establishment of a system of society based upon the common ownership and democratic control of the means and instruments for producing and distributing wealth by and in the interests of the whole community.

DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain

HOLDS—

That society as at present constituted is based upon the ownership of the means of living (i.e., land, factories, railways, etc.) by the capitalist or master class, and the consequent enslavement of the working class by whose labour alone wealth is produced.

That in society, therefore, there is an antagonism of interests, manifesting itself as a class struggle, between those who possess but do not produce and those who produce but do not possess.

That this antagonism can be abolished only by the emancipation of the working class from the domination of the master class, by the conversion into the common property of society of the means of production and distribution, and their democratic control by the whole people.

That as in the order of social evolution the working class is the last class to achieve its freedom, the emancipation of the working class will involve the emancipation of all mankind, without distinction of race or sex.

That this emancipation must be the work of the working class itself.

That as the machinery of government, including the armed forces of the nation, exists only to conserve the monopoly by the capitalist class of the wealth taken from the workers, the working class must organise consciously and politically for the conquest of the powers of government, national and local, in order that this machinery, including these forces, may be converted from an instrument of oppression into the agent of emancipation and the overthrow of privilege, aristocratic and plutocratic.

That as political parties are but the expression of class interests, and as the interest of the working class is diametrically opposed to the interests of all sections of the master class, the party seeking working-class emancipation must be hostile to every other party.

The SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain, therefore, enters the field of political action determined to wage war against all other political parties, whether alleged labour or avowedly capitalist, and calls upon the members of the working class of this country to muster under its banner to the end that a speedy termination may be wrought to the system which deprives them of the fruits of their labour, and that poverty may give place to comfort, privilege to equality, and slavery to freedom.

Those agreeing with the above principles and desiring enrolment in the Party should apply for membership form to secretary of nearest branch or at Head Office.

THE Socialist Standard

The Official Organ of **THE SOCIALIST PARTY** of Great Britain.

No. 298. Vol. 25.]

LONDON, JUNE, 1929.

[MONTHLY, TWOPENCE.]

A PUSH FOR SOCIALISM.

A friend has written asking our advice as to what he and his friends are to do on May 30th. Are they to vote for the "do-nothing Labour Party," or to write the word "Socialism" across their ticket once more. Our friend confesses himself tired of waiting for the Socialist Party to put up candidates, and expresses his wonder that the teachings of Karl Marx and Engels are not more stimulating on such occasions. It is unfortunate, but this issue was not published in time to help our friend to make up his mind, but if he is a regular reader of our paper, he will have perused our April number, where this point was purposely dealt with in ample time for the General Election. It may comfort our friend to know that we are more tired than he, awaiting the opportunity to vote for the first Socialist candidate. That opportunity would have occurred last week but for one thing: the workers were not ready. We had the candidate and the constituency. All we wanted was the deposit money. The Representation of the People Act provides that a candidate must deposit the sum of £150 on nomination, and be prepared to forfeit that sum if he fails to poll an eighth of the total vote cast. Among the differences that distinguish the Socialist Party from the Labour Party is the marked paucity of millionaires, majors, peers, professors and divines in our ranks. We therefore have to rely solely and entirely upon the voluntary coppers of the poor. We have not, nor would we desire, a loose arrangement with the Trade Unions by which they provide the funds and we the candidates. Nor do we receive subsidies from the Russian Government. So that until a sufficient number of the working-class want the Socialist solution of the

poverty problem, and further are prepared to stint themselves to provide the immediate sinews of war, we can only do what is within our powers.

Our correspondent is disappointed. So are we. But in our disappointment there is no despair. On the contrary, we were never more hopeful. To anyone who can read the portents, the future is full of promise. Although these lines are written before the General Election, it is obvious that we are in for a politically livelier time for the next generation. It is extremely doubtful if any Parliament in the immediate future will last the time or have the heavy majority of the last one. Political instability, coupled with economic worsening should, as rationalization proceeds apace, give us the audience we wish for. Five years of political torpor dulled concern in things parliamentary, but with interest keyed up by change and economic insecurity, we believe the working-class will respond to the message of the Socialist. Our overwhelming concern of the moment is to get that message across, and to keep hammering it home. Thousands of pamphlets, thousands of leaflets, monthly, weekly and daily journals, those are what we want. Then will follow thousands of members, hundreds of thousands of members, and then — Socialism.

Perhaps our correspondent will feel more hopeful if he learns that after years of patient and crippling effort, we have succeeded in getting offices a little more worthy of the Party. With a building of four stories and a basement, we shall be better equipped to make our name and message known throughout the world. When one thinks of the work that has been accomplished in the old cramped premises, and

contrasts what should be confidently anticipated from the new, one feels youthful again and filled with golden hope. When we are settled down, we hope our friends and those interested will come and see us. But more of that another time.

And what about our motor propaganda van? Ah! you have not heard of that. There is every possibility that you will see it in your district before very long. Does not that open up visions of wide and rapid propaganda; of our message being carried wherever a road exists; of provincial towns; of relays of speakers and batteries of literature? The possibilities are immense. Why, instead of feeling disappointed, we know that we are just about to commence in earnest. We see that things are moving and that we are about to take a great leap forward. There is one great and pressing immediate need: MONEY. If we were presented with a whole fleet of motor-vans to-morrow, not one would turn a wheel without petrol. And petrol is not bought with promises. As our dear friend the Prince said recently, "Sympathy is not enough." It won't buy an eyeful of petrol. So if there is any friend, sympathiser, or well-wisher, who would like to see not one, but a hundred Socialist candidates at the next General Election, let them implement their good wishes with something more solid in a Capitalist world—money.

It can be done in hundreds of small ways. Remember the Thames has been flowing night and day for thousands of years, and it is made up entirely of rain-drops no larger than a pea. Buy an extra "SOCIALIST STANDARD" every pay-day and give it away to a pal. Buy our pamphlet, "Socialism," 48 packed pages for twopence; better value than Benns' sixpenny booklet, three times the price and only double the number of pages. Keep on buying the pamphlet and sending to your friends. They will never become Socialists if they never hear about it. Above all, no matter how small the effort you can make, be regular. A regular income to the Party means regular progress, and regular progress means Socialism—in our lifetime. Look out for the Socialist Van, but if it does not show up soon enough for you, reflect that we have petrol and oil to buy, and tax and insurance to meet. And then, be practical.

W. T. H.

TO WIVES, MOTHERS AND OTHERS.

A few months ago I promised to show you how you could improve your conditions of life by using your vote in the right direction. Now, in order to carry out that promise I intend using one particular instance, the remedy for which applies also to other troubles that arise from the present mode of living—that of only being able to obtain necessities if you have the money, although you have worked harder than those who have the luxuries. Apart from the everyday worry of providing food and clothing, the housing problem is a special worry at the moment—even to those who have the other necessities.

So we will see about the whys and wherefores and the way in which we can put things right.

Most of us are, or have been, faced with the difficulties of the housing problem, and instead of insisting that houses be built because they are urgently required, we take no organised action in the matter, but hope some day things will be better.

While we are putting up with antiquated and insanitary houses, we see all around us business premises being extended, garages and cinemas being built and old houses giving place to non-residential buildings, even though they be more commodious than those we live in, and still we are the silent sufferers and cast longing eyes and hope.

Much has been made of the housing problem at election times of late years, and at such times, if at no other, you manage to attend meetings or read circulars promising to alleviate your housing and other financial troubles.

The candidate who puts the case most plausibly gets your vote, then you leave him to carry out his promises and forget to notice whether he does so or not.

At the next election you do likewise, but somehow things seem just as bad as ever. You still find it a struggle to make ends meet, but the reason does not strike you, except, perhaps, that you put it down to your husband not getting enough money or that there are not enough houses built.

It is not that there are not enough land, building materials and workers to build houses (or materials for making clothes and food), but because there is not much profit to be made from building houses for the vast number requiring them, so that only those

things are done which do produce a profit, this being the natural result of living in a system of society which is run on profit-seeking lines.

The various governments which have been in power since the war—the starting point of the present housing shortage—have done little to remedy the shortage. They have given the builders subsidies (which shows the power they can use) to encourage them to build, and the councils have made some effort to provide accommodation for those who could not afford to pay the market price. Does it not seem strange to you—if you will ponder a moment—that the obtaining of such important items as decent housing conditions, good food, etc., should depend, not on the needs of the people who do most of the work, but upon the profit-making of the few?

Now we come to the question. How and why is it that the majority of the people are worse off than their employers—the few? Mainly because the workers do not realise that their vote plays so important a part in influencing their conditions of life.

Let us remember that whatever government has been in power its influence has been used, for instance, in deciding industrial disputes, even to the extent of using the police, soldiers, etc., and don't forget that those who *have* to work for a living are those who have the majority of votes and are themselves responsible for having elected the governments which have used their power against the workers.

Think what could be done if those who required houses, etc., organised together to get those needs fulfilled, recognising that one can do little by oneself.

What might take place is this:—

A candidate is elected to Parliament by the majority of voters in a particular locality. Since he (or she) represents the majority he could be made their servant—as it were—to carry out the wishes of that majority. He could be made, when attending the Central Organisation (Parliament) to put forward and endeavour to carry out the wishes of his electors.

Now most of you are quite clever at making a 1/- do the work of 2/- in various ways, saving, cooking, etc., but you might go on with that struggle for ever and your children likewise, if you do not try to devote at least a little of your time to thinking of how you can abolish that terrible nightmare of trying to make ends meet. Like the

other jobs you are doing, it only requires practice and you will soon get the hang of it.

What is taking place in this country is, generally speaking, taking place in other up-to-date countries—therefore mothers, wives and others are faced with the same thoughts and problems and have similar methods of cure, too, if they only knew how to use the remedy. We are all in the same boat.

Under a more reasonable arrangement of society, if the majority decide that more houses or corn, clothes or fuel are required, then it would be easy enough for that majority to see that the factories, etc., are set to work to provide the necessary goods, whereas now the very goods the workers pile up for their masters they must very often go without until such time as the goods have been disposed of to *somebody else*.

The method of production and distribution under which the people freely use the goods that they make in common by common agreement, we call Socialism and those organised for that purpose are Socialists. This method of common ownership can be carried out successfully only when the majority vote in that direction and put their candidates forward to change the present system of a few owning all, to ownership by all, that is by society as a whole.

The rather hard lesson we all have to learn is that our everyday bread and butter questions can only be solved in what looks at first a roundabout method. To make our homes worth living in and to make our lives themselves more worth living, we have got to get together in a political organisation—the Socialist Party—for the purpose of gaining control of the key which will open all these closed doors. That key is Parliament. Parliament carries out the wishes of the majority. But if the majority have no decided views or are divided, the Capitalist minority will go on as now, running the world in the way which is very comfortable for them, but not for us. We tell you the way out, and we are sure that if you think about it you will sooner or later agree with us.

You have tried Conservative, Liberal and Labour. We ask you to try Socialism instead. But you must first understand what Socialism is and how it is to be attained.

When we ask for your vote it is not with the idea of promising to do something

for you, but with the idea of getting you to join us in building up a system of society in which all will co-operate to produce and distribute the things needed by all. It is not a question involving bloodshed or violence. It only requires a majority of convinced Socialists to take organised political action through Parliament. We are workers just as you are, wives, labourers, clerks, bricklayers, managers, salesmen, shop assistants and unemployed, etc. Our needs are the same as yours. Help us to satisfy them.

MRS. GILMAC.

COMMUNIST RIOTING.

The Socialist Party takes its stand on the policy so clearly stated and defended by Marx and Engels that the working class must, as a preliminary to the establishment of Socialism, gain control of the political machinery of society. They can do this in the advanced Capitalist countries through political organisation and the use of the vote; the working class possessing, as they do, the overwhelming majority of votes. The Communists reject this theory of Marx founded on the lessons of everyday experience, and advocate the fundamentally different and fundamentally unsound policy of trying to create a working class armed force with which an attempt is to be made to fight and overthrow the armed forces of the Capitalist state. They reject the possibility of gaining control of the political machinery and the existing armed forces, and base their hopes instead on barricades and street fighting. Bucharin, speaking for the Executive at the 1928 Congress in Moscow of the Third International, made no attempt to hide this aim of the Communists. The following extract from his speech is taken from a report in the Communist publication "International Press Correspondence" (July 30th, 1928):—

Mass actions must be regarded as one of the best means in our struggle. Our tactics must be to mobilise the masses, to become masters of the streets, to attack again and again the law and order of the bourgeoisie State and to smash it, to capture the street by revolutionary means, in the strict sense of the word, and then to go further. Only on the basis of a whole series of such events and on the basis of the development of these events—mass actions, etc.—only through such a process can we prepare ourselves for fiercer and more stubborn mass struggles on a larger scale.

MAY DAY MADNESS.

On the instructions of the Third International the German Communists tried out this policy on May Day. May Day street demonstrations by every party had been prohibited by the Berlin Police Authorities because of the alleged danger of conflict between rival organisations. The Communists announced in advance their intention of defying the prohibition. According to a report published in the "Daily Herald" (May 1st) and received from German Labour Party sources, the Executive Committee of the German Communist Party were prepared for 200 deaths, but nevertheless gave instructions for demonstrations to be held at all costs. The demonstrations ended in an attempt by the Communists to hold two Berlin working class districts (Wedding and Neuköln) against the police. Barricades were thrown up consisting of tree trunks, paving stones, overturned carts, etc., and Communist snipers are reported to have fired on the police from houses in these areas. Brutal methods were used by the police. In all 23 people were killed and many others wounded before the authorities finally suppressed the demonstrators. The following summary of this criminal action of the Communists, taken from the "Manchester Guardian," is based on the first-hand reports of their representative in Berlin:—

Many of the casualties were youthful Communists, most of them were inoffensive passers-by, only a few were policemen—it does not seem that one policeman was killed. Nearly all the execution was done by police rifles and machine-guns. The Communist rioters were poorly armed—they do not seem to have had more than a few revolvers—nor do they themselves seem to have been very numerous. The police showed some restraint at first, but then fell upon their opponents with great savagery, shooting and bludgeoning rioters and casual passers-by alike. ("Manchester Guardian," May 7th.)

Only one policeman was injured in the actual fighting on May Day, and the following days, and he shot himself by accident. ("Daily Telegraph," 8th May.)

THE DUMMY.

This incident only serves once more to indicate the futility of the whole Communist theory of armed revolt. The Capitalist class, by their control of the State machinery, control powerful armed forces possessing all the latest and most potent weapons of destruction. In addition they can and do prevent the formation of any serious rival force. Even if the workers

had any means of purchasing expensive modern weapons they would have no means of training themselves to use them. The "Guardian" points out how these hare-brained "revolutionaries" sent their boy dupes into action against a semi-military police force, armed only with a few revolvers. The "Guardian" is not quite accurate. According to photographs published in the London press, they also had at least one machine gun—a dummy! With it they attempted to scare off the police. A harassed policeman is certainly likely to lie low when he sees something which looks like a machine gun. But these Communist children had apparently overlooked the very pertinent fact that to a fleet of tanks it is a question of supreme indifference whether your machine gun is a dummy or not. The authorities brought out their tanks and their armoured aeroplanes, with troops in reserve, and the issue was never in doubt. Even if the Communists could have resisted for a few days they never explained, and do not appear to have considered, what they were going to do with Wedding and Neuköln after they had demonstrated their ability, temporarily, to hold them against the police.

POLICE SPIES.

Even the temporary success of such a move depends on a circumstance which is so unlikely as to be well nigh impossible of achievement, that is to keep the plans from the police. It is common knowledge that semi-secret organisations advocating violence as does the Communist Party, are honeycombed with police agents and informers.

In Paris, also, May Day demonstrations were forbidden, and there also the Communists threatened to defy the prohibition. The police accordingly rounded up the leaders just prior to May Day and kept a large number under preventive detention. This practice serves a twofold purpose. It deprives the rank and file of their leadership and at the same time enables the police to save their spies from danger or exposure by keeping them, with other prisoners, safely under lock and key.

How prevalent spying is and how difficult to detect is shown by the case of "John Vidor," author of "Spying in Russia." This person (the name is apparently an assumed one) claims that he not only wormed his way into the Communist movement, but got himself sent to Russia as a member of the "Workers' Delegation,"

which went there in 1927. (See "Daily Telegraph," 3rd May.)

The "Morning Post" periodically prints scare articles written by one of its informers who apparently holds some minor official position in the British Communist Party.

MASS ACTION—MASS SUICIDE.

History knows many instances of romantic hot-heads vainly trying to overthrow powerful Governments without considering the hopelessness of the odds against them, being, in fact, more interested in heroics and martyrdom than anything else. But it has remained for the modern Communist movement to reduce this tactic to its last futility. Ever since the formation of the Communist Parties we have seen them denouncing the alleged Labour Parties as being in fact parties of Capitalism. We have also seen them voting these parties into control of the political machinery and the armed forces of the State. Finally, having placed in the hands of Capitalist parties the power to build up armed forces for the defence of Capitalism, they then commit the further criminal folly of sending boys "armed" with revolvers and dummy machine guns against the tanks and battle-planes controlled by those whom they have voted into power. The Communists, in pursuing this policy, are a danger only to themselves and to the working class.

H.

ANSWER TO CORRESPONDENT.

The correspondent who asked how to vote is referred to the article in this issue "A Push for Socialism."

IMPORTANT.

CHANGE OF ADDRESS.

Please note that our address now is—
42, GREAT DOVER STREET, S.E. .
(Near Borough Underground Station.)

SHEFFIELD.

Will those willing to assist in forming a branch in the above area communicate with—

E. BODEN,
Mylnhurst Road, Ecclesall.

SAKLATVALA ON SOCIALISM.

The Communist Party of Great Britain have recently published a small pamphlet entitled "Socialism and Labourism," which is an "edited" report of a speech delivered by Mr. Saklatvala in the House of Commons on March 21st, 1928.

Judging by the speech as a whole, Mr. Saklatvala is either ignorant as to the meaning of Socialism, or is prepared to withhold his knowledge from the workers. Let us take one or two points from the speech. On page 5 of the pamphlet he says:—

It may be possible without at all disturbing the Capitalist character of society and without coming near Socialism, to extend the ownership of any particular enterprise to all the citizens of a country.

It may be possible, but it is difficult to see how it is possible to extend ownership to all under Capitalism, which is based on ownership by a class. One of the most patent features of Capitalism is that, as the system develops wealth becomes concentrated into fewer and fewer hands, the smaller Capitalists being thrust by competition, etc., into the ranks of the workers, whose numbers become greater and greater in relation to the numbers of the Capitalists. A relatively few people now own the wealth of society as a result of Capitalist development. How in the name of commonsense, then, can the workers have the opportunity to own more whilst the processes that make them non-owners are still retained?

An explanation of this contradiction is given on page 6:—

The Post Office is private enterprise, but the shareholders are all the citizens of the nation. . . . That although there is no Socialism about a Post Office in a capitalist country, there is certainly the compensation that the shareholders are so expanded that everybody within the State stands to lose or gain by its losses or profits.

Here we have the familiar assumption that the workers are concerned with taxation, and are therefore interested in the rise and fall of the revenue of the Post Office, or other "nationalised" concerns. The statement shows a complete lack of understanding of the economic position of the workers in society. Actually, the workers as a whole own nothing but their working power, which they are forced to sell to their Capitalist masters in order to live. The price the workers receive for this labour power is called salary or wages and, like all other commodities, is based on the cost of pro-

duction. In other words, they receive in the long run a bare sufficiency in wages to reproduce the energy which has been expended in the production of wealth for the profit of their masters. Without wages the workers could not exist to carry on wealth production under Capitalism. We see, therefore, that the high cost of living must be accompanied by higher wages, while, inversely, a fall in the cost of living brings about a fall in wages. Of course, wages will tend to fall in those industries where the supply of "labour-power" is greater than the demand, and a rise in wages is the almost inevitable result of a scarcity of "labour-power." Here again the strength or weakness of the workers' economic organisations may assist somewhat in determining the measure of gain or loss to the workers under these conditions. But these fluctuations in wages are the effect of "supply" and "demand," and they do not affect the *basis* (i.e., the cost of production) which determines the wages of the worker. It will be seen, then, that the incidence of taxation, direct or indirect, cannot permanently influence the condition of the workers, and is of importance only to their Capitalist masters and Capitalist politicians like Mr. Saklatvala, who, unthinkingly, pander to the political ignorance of the workers.

Another typical example of confusion is to be found on pp. 6 and 7 of the pamphlet:—

What is the real problem before the country as between Socialism and Capitalism? . . . It is a question of overthrowing the system of private ownership and introducing public ownership.

But what is "public" ownership? Mr. Saklatvala does not explain. The Post Office, Municipal "Trams," Borough Council Houses and other national or municipal services, are generally regarded by the workers as examples of "public" ownership, because of their pathetic belief that they pay rates and taxes for the upkeep of these concerns. A survey of the list of holders of "Government Consols" and "Municipal Stock," however, would soon shatter this illusion. There is outstanding on the Post Office services a debt of £68 millions and on the L.C.C. a debt of about £120 millions. It is the investors who hold and receive interest on these loans who are the owners of what Mr. Saklatvala calls "public" property.

The Socialist rendering of the last sentence of the passage quoted would be as

follows:—"It is a question of overthrowing the system of private ownership, and instituting a system based on Common Ownership and democratic control of the means and instruments of wealth production and distribution." The substitution of this sentence for the other would produce the change from a foggy abstraction to a crystal clear definition of object.

Again on p. 8 Mr. Saklatvala reveals his ignorance as to what Socialism implies:—

If we were to apply the real principles of Socialism to the coal mines, the first consideration would be to secure the control of the miners themselves over their own industry.

Substitute "syndicalism" for "Socialism" and this passage would read all right! To bring forward once again this old exploded nonsense of "Mines for the Miners," "Printing Machines for the Printers," "Railways for Railwayworkers," "Sewers for the Sewermen" is surely intended as a joke in these days, when it is so evident that all industries are interdependent and production is social in character. Only the replacement of private ownership by social (or common) ownership can harmonize the relations of wealth production and ownership.

On page 9 we find the amazing assertion, without an attempt to offer any evidence in its support, that

there is one country which has achieved Socialism. Presumably Russia? If so, then it would be necessary to suppose that under Socialism we would still have a wages system, still have peasant proprietorship of land, still have buying and selling, still have an owning and a non-owning class, and still have an ever-increasing army of unemployed workers. Russia has all of these luxuries in abundance! The truth is, unfortunately, that Russia, far from achieving Socialism, which involves the abolition of all of these features of Capitalism, is a very tardy entrant into the ranks of countries seeking development on Capitalist lines.

References to Capitalist society being "unjust" (p. 12), and to "equal remuneration" (p. 14) provide further evidence of "Communist" confusion. "Justice" and "Injustice" are purely relative terms decided by those in power. The Capitalist class are in power to-day, and therefore it is "just" for them to exploit the workers. When the workers have gained control of power (i.e., Political Control) they will abolish this particular form of "justice." It is the RIGHT OF POWER which de-

cides all questions of "justice" and "injustice." As "wages" will no longer exist under Socialism, and wealth will be distributed and apportioned according to the varying needs of members of society, the question of "equal remuneration" becomes ridiculous.

In the introductory note to the pamphlet the C.P. state that in order to ensure wide distribution of the pamphlet at one penny it has been necessary to abridge portions of Mr. Saklatvala's speech. It is interesting to note that one of the excisions deemed necessary is the following admission regarding Russia:—

M. Stalin's argument is that, deplorable as the industrial development of Russia is at the present time, the needs and requirements of the people of Russia make them dependent upon other countries for manufactured articles which cannot be supplied in Russia owing to the backwardness and the apathy of the working classes, who have not yet developed as far as a Socialist revolution.

We suspect that space was not the real reason for leaving out this passage.

Many absurdities are to be found in the pamphlet, but enough examples have been shewn to afford an explanation as to why our task of educating the workers in Socialist knowledge is so difficult and to demonstrate clearly that the Communist Party is a hindrance and not a help in the struggle of the workers to achieve their emancipation. E.J.M.

TRAFALGAR SQUARE

A MEETING

WILL BE HELD ON

SUNDAY, JUNE 9th

at 3 p.m.

 Send your TINFOIL to the General Secretary at the Head Office—It will help to Raise Funds.

OFFICIAL NOTICE.

All communications for the Executive Committee, Subscriptions for the *SOCIALIST STANDARD*, Articles, and Correspondence submitted for insertion therein, should be addressed—The Socialist Party of Great Britain, 42, Great Dover Street, London, S.E.1, to whom Money Orders should be made payable.

The meetings of the Executive Committee are held at the Head Office, every Tuesday, at 7.30 p.m.

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTIONS.

Twelve Months, post free... .. 2s. 6d.
Six Months, post free 1s. 3d.

The Socialist Standard,

JUNE,



1929

THE LABOUR PARTY AND THE FUTURE.

At the time of writing, a few of the Election results have yet to be announced, but the general position is clear enough. The Labour Party will be the largest of the three Parties in the new House of Commons, and although lacking a clear majority over the other two parties, it will presumably take over the Government with the tacit consent of the Liberals, more or less as in 1924.

The Labour Party will have 288 seats, as compared with 251 Tories and 54 Liberals. As regards voting strength in the constituencies they polled 8,337,407 votes, as against 8,575,532 given to Tory candidates and 5,238,054 to Liberals.

In 1924 81 per cent. of the electorate went to the poll, as compared with about 79 per cent. this year. In the meantime the electorate has grown from about 20 million to over 28 million, largely owing to the extension of the franchise to millions of young women.

In the last House a clear majority (over 60 per cent.) of the Labour M.P.s were members of the I.L.P., although the number actually financed by the I.L.P. was of course much smaller. In the present Election, out of 56 candidates, for whom the

I.L.P. accepted financial responsibility, 37 were successful (two results have not yet been declared, but are not likely to be I.L.P. successes). How many of the other Labour M.P.'s are also members of the I.L.P. it is not yet possible to say.

The Communists, with their Russian money, paid very dearly for an elementary lesson in electioneering. They sent 25 candidates to the polls and scored 25 failures. In 21 constituencies they forfeited their deposit through failing to poll one-eighth of the votes. Out of the 25 constituencies, seven (including Saklatvala's seat at Battersea North) have been fought by the Communists on one or more previous occasions. In every one of these seven constituencies the Communist vote declined, in spite of the big increase in the size of the electorate. Saklatvala's vote fell from 15,096 to 6,554 and the loss in the other six constituencies was in most cases very heavy. In the other areas their vote was insignificant.

The lesson they had hitherto not learned is that votes for a Communist who fights on a reformist programme are not votes for Communism. Their success at Motherwell a few years ago, and more recently at Battersea, was possible only because they received Labour votes owing to the absence of an official Labour candidate. (In face of the vast increase in the Labour vote and the insignificant Communist vote, it is amusing to recall that the Communist excuse for supporting Labour in 1923 was that the Labour Party would be discredited and the Communists would gain at their expense.)

The I.L.P. long ago recognised that they must carefully avoid anything which would cause the Labour Party to oppose the I.L.P. candidates. Between elections the Maxtons and Wheatleys and other incipient leaders of revolt can produce their thunder on the left as noisily as any communist. But election time finds them hastily deserting their rebel colours and rallying round the Labour Party and fighting as Labour candidates.

IS IT SOCIALISM.

What is the real significance of the Labour vote? Does it mean that 8 million people want Socialism? The *Daily Herald* says that it does. In the editorial of June 1st we read the following:—

This great appeal to the people has shown that Socialism has no terrors for millions of men and

women in this country of all classes and callings. The magnificent results we record to-day are an earnest that at no very distant date the banners of Socialism will be carried to that final victory of which the present triumph is only a prelude.

Without in the least imputing dishonesty to the writer of that passage, we confidently assert that his view is hopelessly wrong. The Election shows that 8 million people are not afraid of the word Socialism; it shows that millions of workers have satisfied themselves that men and women of their own class are at least as capable administrators as the men of the ruling class and their professional politicians. That is all to the good, but it is very far removed from a desire for Socialism. The working class have lost their horror of the word Socialism, but they have hardly begun to understand the meaning of the word. To them Socialism means the administration of capitalism by people calling themselves Labour or Socialist. And therein lies the problem which no Labour Government can solve. We deal elsewhere in this issue with the failure of Labour Government in Queensland. We prophesied that failure and with absolute confidence we prophecy the similar failure of Labour Government here. No matter how able, how sincere, and how sympathetic the Labour men and women may be who undertake to administer capitalism, capitalism will bring their undertaking to disaster. As in Queensland, those who administer capitalism will find themselves sooner or later brought into conflict with the working class. Like their Australian colleagues the Labour Party here will find themselves in a cleft stick. Having no mandate to replace capitalism by Socialism, they have pledged themselves to solve problems which cannot be solved except by doing the one thing for which they have no mandate. That thing is the abolition of the private ownership of the means of production and distribution, and its replacement by common ownership; the production of goods for use not for sale; the discarding of all the paraphernalia of wages, prices, and profits. The millions of Labour voters who are not afraid of the word Socialism because they do not know what it means, would regard as absurd and utopian common ownership and the production of goods for use. Yet it is in sober truth the only solution for the pressing economic problems of the day. Even those workers and their "left wing" leaders, like J. Maxton, W. J.

Brown and others, who are prepared to make inroads into the possessions of the capitalist class, have still another great lesson to learn. They have still to learn that the use of political power for the purpose of forcing capitalism to function in a manner beneficial to the workers is a temporary and a dangerous expedient. It will produce as many and as grave new problems as those it solves. Capitalism is a system, the parts of which are inter-dependent. You cannot remedy the evils and yet keep the system, and you cannot abolish the system without a mandate from a Socialist electorate. This is the dilemma which faces the Labour Party. They are pledged to solve a problem, but lack the means of its solution.

THE LABOUR FAILURE IN QUEENSLAND.

After being in power for 15 years, the Queensland Labour Government was heavily defeated at the General Election early in May. In the last Parliament it held 43 seats out of 72. At the election, the Labour Party lost 16 seats and now holds only 27.

For 15 years the I.L.P. in this country have been proclaiming that Queensland was an illustration of "Socialism in Practice." If that were true we should be faced with the fact that the Queensland workers had tried Socialism and rejected it and, needless to say, this has been gleefully exploited by the Conservatives and Liberals. The truth is that at no time has there been any attempt made to replace Capitalism by Socialism in Queensland or any other Australian State. Capitalism is and always has been the system of society operating there. The Socialist Party all through these years has constantly warned the workers that the Queensland experiment would bring no material change in the position of the working-class there, and would fail to solve any of the various problems arising out of Capitalism. By pretending otherwise, the I.L.P. has been deceiving the workers and misrepresenting Socialism.

One outstanding event which illustrates the impossibility of administering Capitalism for the benefit of the workers was the 1927 railway lock-out. The State railway workers decided to assist striking sugar workers by refusing to handle "blackleg"

goods. The Labour Premier, faced with the necessity of safeguarding the operation of Capitalist industry, locked out 11,000 railwaymen in just the same manner as has been done by non-Labour Governments. Whatever their sympathies, a Government, any Government, which undertakes to administer Capitalism, has no choice but to use the powers of the State in defence of Capitalist interests when these are threatened by striking workers.

Failing to solve the problems which are insoluble within Capitalism and having no mandate to establish Socialism the Queensland Labour Government, like Labour Governments here or elsewhere in the same position, was foredoomed to failure.

The circumstances under which the Queensland Government entered office were clearly explained by Labour Premier Theodore.

Writing in the "Labour Magazine" (London, September, 1923), he expressed himself as follows:—

The Labour Party in Queensland found itself called on to administer a capitalistic state of society, and without any direct mandate or authority to overturn the existing order or to undertake a drastic reconstruction.

Incidentally, this fiasco proves the fallacy of one foolish, if not dishonest, I.L.P. and Communist argument. Members of the I.L.P. who were somewhat critical of the Labour Government, and Communists who frankly condemned it, united in voting for it on the specious plea that after experiencing the failure of the Labour Party, the workers would be ready to "go further."

In "Queensland," the successful party now is the National Country Party, which is frankly Capitalist. The Communists have not got the support which they believed would come to them when Labour failed. What these dishonest supporters of the Labour Party always forget is, that you cannot win Conservative working-men over to voting Labour by telling them that the Labour Party is no good. Communists who tell the workers to vote Labour are, therefore, compelled, if they wish to be effective, to hide their real views and tell the voters that the Labour Party is worth their votes. When the Labour Party proves its inability to solve working-class problems, its Communist supporters are carried down with it, and the disappointed workers vote Conservative "for a change," or stay away from the polls. H.

RATIONALISATION AND UNEMPLOYMENT.

We were amused last year when the Government started to solve the problem of the 250,000 out-of-work miners by transferring them from the mining areas where there are no vacant jobs, to those places where there are vacant jobs. This would have been simplicity itself if there had been any such places, though in that event it would not have been necessary to set up an Industrial Transfer Board to coax the unemployed man to seek the vacant job. Some 20,000 have been transferred, and nobody knows how many of these have been thrust into jobs which were not vacant.

We suspect, however, that the politicians responsible for that venture were not greatly concerned about its success or failure. While it was useful for election purposes, the existence of an unemployed army of a million or so does not, and need not, cause sleepless nights to the Capitalist class or their politicians as long as the workers in the main, whether in work or out, accept as a necessity the Capitalist system of which unemployment is but one feature.

There are, however, many people whose sympathy for the unemployed is beyond question, but whose remedies for the problem contain just that same silly fallacy. They treat each industry or each country as if the workers in it alone suffered from unemployment. By disregarding the same problem due to the same causes in every other industry and country, they are then able easily enough to solve the problem by the simple device of transferring the unemployed in industry A to industries B, C, and D, and by emigrating the surplus population of country Z to countries X and Y.

THE UNEMPLOYED MINERS.

The Labour Party proposes to put the mining industry on its feet again by nationalising and reorganising it. The elimination of wasteful and inefficient methods, both on the productive and marketing sides, will enable it to regain its lost world markets and develop new ones, including the supply of coal for the manufacture of bye-products. This is the theory.

Our first criticism is that competing mining industries in Europe and America are busily doing the same thing, and the relative position of each will be more or less the same after the process as it was before.

Each will be more efficient and all will be faced with the same problems as now.

The main point is that greater efficiency does not solve the problem of unemployment.

Between September, 1924, and September, 1928, the number of miners employed decreased from 1,082,340 to 859,259, and over that period the output per man shift rose from 17.33 cwts. to 21.13 cwts.

Thus the fall in numbers employed far exceeded a fall in total output. (See Ministry of Labour Gazette, February, 1929.)

The Bulletin of the International Management Institute (Geneva, June, 1928) gives an illustration of the similar effects of rationalisation in a German group of mines. Between 1924 and 1927 the output per man rose by 60 per cent., the total coal output and sales rose by 10 per cent. and the number of men employed fell by 31 per cent. from 6,942 men in 1924 to 4,815 men in 1927. More work done by fewer workers. Unemployment resulting from greater efficiency.

Mr. Baldwin, speaking at Cardiff on May 15th, stated that the output per man in the South Wales mines "was 18 per cent. more than in a good year before the war." ("The Times," May 16th.)

Then Mr. H. N. Brailsford, after observing this process at work in America, offers his contribution towards a solution. Writing in the "New Leader" (January 4th, 1929), he suggested a simple remedy. If, he says, we develop the "home market," this would

create a call for labour, especially in agriculture, which would soon absorb the surplus thrown idle by the progress of rationalisation (notably the miners).

So the miners "rationalised" out of the mines must go on the land. Good!

PUTTING THE MINERS ON THE LAND.

But if Mr. Brailsford had looked a little further afield in the U.S.A., he would have observed that, owing to various causes, notably "rationalisation," the number of men forced out of U.S.A. agriculture is enormous. The March, 1928, issue of the Review of the National City Bank of New York states that during 1926 alone, "the net movement from agriculture to the cities... was approximately 1,000,000." Nevertheless, the supply of wheat is in excess of effective demand, and wheat growers have been faced with the "greatest slump of recent years." (See "Manchester Guar-

dian," May 9th.) The New York correspondent of the "Daily Telegraph" (May 22nd) said that the only solution for this glut was a "poor harvest" this year.

In this country we have been told that the decline in wheat and other arable cultivation can be offset by the development of dairy farming. This in itself means a vast decrease in the number of men per acre, as arable land is put under grass.

The effect of rationalisation in agriculture is the same as in any other industry, and the same in every branch. To take one instance alone, the ordinary farm milk-hand can milk and attend to 8 or 10 cows. Mr. R. Borlase Matthews, the noted writer on agriculture, tells us ("The Times," June 6th, 1927) that with electric power and mechanical milking machines 150 cows can be tended by 3 men, whereas without these mechanical aids at least 15 would be needed. Thus the farmer increases the productivity of the farm and sacks some farm hands.

AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTIVITY.

The output of agriculture in England and Wales in 1925 was £225 million.

After allowing for price changes, this was the same as in 1908. (See "Agricultural Output of England and Wales, 1925," Cmd. 2815, p.78.)

In the meantime, there had been a great decrease in the number of persons employed in agriculture and a great increase in the use of machinery.

Owing to changes in method of compiling statistics comparable figures are not available, but the decrease in persons was almost continuous and was very large. The following figures are taken from official sources and are reproduced in "Land and the Nation" (p. 146). This is the Rural Report of the Liberal Land Committee.

Between 1911 and 1921 the number of men and boys over 15 fell from 1,267,000 to 1,212,000. (These figures include farmers, small-holders, etc.) The decrease between 1871 and 1921 was 154,000. Between 1908 and 1913 the number of employees (excluding farmers' sons, etc.) fell from 722,000 to 651,000. And between 1921 and 1924 the number of employees (including farmers' sons, etc.) fell from 859,000 to 802,000. (See "Land and the Nation," p. 146.)

The number of young men fell by 16 per cent. between 1924 and 1928 (Sir Daniel Hall in "Daily Telegraph," January 24th, 1929).

On the other hand, the number of agricultural engines in use in England and Wales rose from 17,331 in 1908 to 83,535 in 1925. (See "Agricultural Output," p. 108.)

Petrol or oil engines rose from 6,911 to 56,744 in the same period.

WHAT ABOUT DENMARK?

Mr. T. Shaw, Minister of Labour in the Labour Government, wrote in the "Morning Post" (February 18th) setting out his views on unemployment. He saw the solution in rationalising agriculture and making it efficient in all its branches, like agriculture in Denmark. How futile is the remedy is shown by the figures of unemployment in that country. The Ministry of Labour Gazette for January shows that the percentage of unemployment in Denmark on November 30th (the latest figure available) was no less than 17.6 per cent. as compared with 11.7 per cent. in this country.

CONDITIONS IN AMERICA.

Then we have "experts" here and in the U.S.A. who tell us that this increased productivity and consequent reduction of staff in productive industry and agriculture need not disturb us, because the displaced men will find work in commercial and financial occupations. Thus, Mr. Herbert Hoover explains in the Fifteenth Annual Report of the U.S.A. Secretary of Commerce, how the men displaced from industry have been absorbed in "distribution" and in "professional" and "personal" services. This would be a plausible explanation of the absence of unemployment in the U.S.A. if, in fact, unemployment were absent. Unfortunately, there is heavy unemployment, and what is required is a theory explaining the existence of unemployment, not a theory explaining its non-existence.

The American Federation of Labour reported early last year that 18 per cent. of its members were out of work, and that on this basis they estimated unemployment amounting in all to six million ("Daily Telegraph," April 3rd, 1928).

In this country we have Lord Ebbisham, President of the Federation of British Industries, admitting that rationalisation in the productive industries produces unemployment, but assuring us that the men relieved of jobs can go into commerce, finance and marketing. (See "Morning Post," January 14th.)

PUT THE LANDWORKERS BEHIND THE COUNTER.

So our miners who have been placed on the land by Mr. Brailsford, and then rationalised off the land, must look for salvation in the banks and the distributive trades.

Lord Ebbisham, when making this statement, of course overlooked the fact that there is already 6.4 per cent. of unemployment in the distributive trades (See Ministry of Labour Gazette, April), and that the recent rapid extension of the use of automatic machines of a large type has brought forth protests from shop assistants and small shopkeepers that their livelihood is being threatened still further. Recent amalgamations of big departmental stores have been accompanied by considerable economies in staff. In addition, it must be remembered that small shopkeepers, crowded out by the stores, are not entitled to unemployment pay, and so will, in many cases, not register as unemployed.

WHAT SHALL WE DO WITH THE BANK CLERKS?

And the Bank Clerks are also playing this great game of General Post. They, too, are being "rationalised."

Mechanical ledger-porters and other machines are being installed with the result not only that staffs will be decreased, but scales of pay also. Mr. Clegg, President of the Bank Officers' Guild, anticipates the reorganisation of the bank staffs in two grades, "the administrative being a small, well-paid body, chiefly of directors' nominees, and the clerical a large and not well-paid body." ("The Times," May 20th, 1929.)

Two of the five big Joint Stock Banks have already decided on complete mechanisation, and the others are expected to follow suit in the immediate future. The "Daily Express" (May 8th) sums up the position in the following words:—

The bank clerks of past generations will disappear and machine hands will take their place. . . . Bank clerks are naturally apprehensive. The introduction of the new machines opens up the prospect of wholesale unemployment.

In an interview reported in the same issue, the Secretary of the Bank Officers' Guild told a "Daily Express" representative that

two girls can easily perform the work of five or six men with the help of the machine. . . . The Midland Bank already has a considerable surplus staff as a result of the adoption of mechanical methods.

LET US ALL BE CIVIL SERVANTS.

But this problem, too, has been "solved." In August last year, the "New Leader" had been explaining how the I.L.P. proposed to nationalise and make more efficient the banks of this country. A correspondent had claimed that "enormous economies could be effected." This led to a Bank Clerk's wife writing to ask what was going to happen to the bank clerks whose jobs were economised out of existence. ("New Leader," August 24th, 1928.)

The Editor of the "New Leader" replied that the bank clerk's wife need not worry, because the redundant staff "could usefully be incorporated in the Civil Service, which would require to be extended by the development of social activity in many directions."

So our miner, after a brief sojourn down on the farm, and a briefer passage through a bank, will land eventually in the Civil Service, somewhat puzzled, but doubtless still trusting in the wisdom of his various leaders and still hopeful of a permanent resting place soon.

WHAT SHALL WE DO WITH THE CIVIL SERVANTS?

It is, however, hardly necessary to add that the replacement of men by machines, and their displacement owing to the elimination of wasteful methods, goes on just as inevitably in the Civil Service. Foot-postmen are being replaced by a smaller number of motor-cyclists and motor-vans; the indoor handling of parcels is economised by the use of mechanical conveyors; automatic telephone exchanges make the employment of telephone operators less and less necessary. For many years the total volume of old and new varieties of work in the Post Office has been increasing more rapidly than the size of the staff. The output per head is rising just as in the mines, and factories generally. The constant extension of Post Office work is offset by the increased demands made on the workers—and the machinery which is revolutionising banking is also being introduced into Government Departments.

The Conservative Government stated their intention of appointing a Civil Service Royal Commission to enquire into various questions. "The Times" then pointed out that

there are many members of the House of Commons who believe that an inquiry of this kind might lead to a reduction in the number of civil servants (26 April, 1929).

So that prospects in the Civil Service look no more rosy than outside.

THE FILMS AND THE "TALKIES."

Then we find our old friend Lord Ebbisham going a step further in his study of the problem. On Wednesday, May 1st, he addressed the Federation of British Industries on the trade prospects. He said that the falling-off in the pre-war basic trades had been offset by expansion in distribution services.

Then there was the increased demand for entertainment and amusement, resulting largely from the post-war reduction in hours of employment. (Report in *Times*, 2 May, 1929.)

So now our ex-miner farmhand-bank-clerk-Civil Servant are to pin their hopes on the entertainment industry. The first objection is that although shorter hours may increase the time available for going to cinemas and theatres this is not of much use to unemployed men, who cannot afford the price of entry. But what is more to the point is that rationalisation is vigorously attacking the entertainment industry too. The percentage of unemployment in "Entertainments and Sports" is 11.1 per cent. (See Ministry of Labour Gazette, April.) Theatres are complaining more and more of their inability to compete with cinemas, and for many years now the unemployment among actors and variety artistes has been appalling. The latest development—the "talkies"—has spread consternation among the cinema musicians as cinema after cinema dispenses with its orchestra. The "Evening News" (April 30th) contained the following:—

While all the talkie-talkie among the moneyed friends and the equally well-to-do opponents of the voice film is going on, there is a silent and melancholy drama happening in London.

Cinema musicians are, orchestra by orchestra, being told to pack up their bows and violins, their 'cellos, and all the rest and take formal notice of "the sack." Most of them are accomplished players to whom the cinema seemed to promise a lifetime of steady work.

Now the majority, scrapped by the talkie, do not know where bread and butter is to come from a few weeks hence.

An orchestra recently played, brilliantly, behind closed doors a record for a British talkie that, when it is developed in America and sent back here for exhibition, will throw that same orchestra out of its job, and will circulate all over the country and similarly displace other orchestras.

The Musicians' Union held a meeting to discuss the question on Wednesday, May 15th (See "Evening Standard" of that

date.) Here it was pointed out that the new methods had the effect not only of causing unemployment, but also of lowering the salaries of those who succeeded in keeping their jobs. An official of the Union also made a very telling point. The Home Office have, in the past, kept alien musicians out of the country on account of unemployment. The official said:—

"An alien musician throws only one British musician out of work; one 'talkie' may put a hundred out of work."

It is true, of course, that the declining demand for cinema actors and actresses who have not suitable voices is offset by the demand for others who have, but, in America, the home of the movies, unemployment is already widespread among actors. In January it was stated that there were nearly 9,000 unemployed in New York alone.

Miss Lya de Putti, the famous film star, also points out ("Evening Standard," May 20th) that

as crowds are not required in many talking films, "extras," too, are being thrown out of work in hundreds.

Mr. Lawrence Wright, in a letter to the "Morning Post" (May 20th) on the "talkie" threat to the employment of musicians in the 10,000 cinemas of this country, stated that the "talkies" in the U.S.A. had "precipitated the most shocking unemployment among musicians in America."

GOOD NEWS FOR CIGARETTE MAKERS.

The next move is obviously with Lord Ebbisham. One thing, however, he must not do. He must not try to put the ex-musicians at work making cigarettes. A representative of the "Daily Telegraph" (May 3rd, 1929) witnessed a demonstration of a new machine installed at the factory of the General Tobacco Co., St. Luke's, London.

It was said to be the first of its kind in Great Britain capable of converting tobacco into the finished cigarette—plain or tipped—in five seconds, and at the record speed of 1,200 a minute. Only three persons were required to tend the machine, with an output equal to 700 workers under old methods. Another machine, which was also said to be the first installed in this country, was a cutter run by one man which turned out sufficient material to keep three of the cigarette machines going at the rate of over 200,000 cigarettes an hour.

Having got so far, and while we await further brilliant solutions of the problem, what about making work for the redundant

Civil Servants by setting up another department to transfer the unemployed ex-miner-farm-labourer-bank-clerks to the pits, while the Industrial Transfer Board transfers them back again. Then the unemployed musicians can play them along the road, both ways! One improvement, at least, there promises to be. Mr. Lloyd George's road schemes would certainly facilitate the movement and counter-movement of the unemployed at the hands of the Transfer Board.

A QUESTION FOR THE EMPLOYERS.

When these undeniable facts showing the displacement of labour by machinery are brought to the notice of the employers and the professional apologists for Capitalism, they usually fall back on two arguments.

First they reply that machinery reduces costs and prices, and that lowered prices result in bigger sales, which render unnecessary the dismissal of staff. But their actions do not square with what they profess to believe. Lowered prices will, it is true, generally speaking, result in increased sales, but if the increase were sufficient to require the employment of the whole of the former staff, why do the employers ever dismiss workers when installing labour-saving machines?

The employers could demonstrate their belief in their theory by pledging themselves not to decrease their staff, something they will certainly not do.

Their second argument rests on the belief that when men are displaced by machinery an equal number of additional men are required in the machine-making and allied industries. This ignores the effects of labour-saving also applied in these branches of production. Again the facts belie the theory.

The Ministry of Labour Gazette (April, 1929) reported the following percentages of unemployment at the end of March in industries directly concerned in the making of machinery. Engineering, 8.1 per cent.; Iron and Steel Manufacture, 17.6 per cent.; Tinplate and Steel Sheet industries, 23.7 per cent.

The following brief announcement gives point to our contention:—

Two hundred workers at Dowlais steel-works are on notice to terminate their employment owing to the introduction of new machinery (*Daily Herald*, May 8th.)

In the cotton industry a new automatic loom is being introduced so simple in its

mechanism that one man can operate 25 looms in place of the present average of one man to 4 looms. The new looms will run for an hour or more without attention, and it is recognised that "dislocation of labour conditions would inevitably follow any large scale introduction of such a revolutionary piece of mechanism." (See "Daily Telegraph" and "Manchester Guardian," May 13th.) But even should there be a big demand for these and other machines, the existing capacity of the machine manufacturing plants is already well above demand, and they are, in consequence, not working full pressure. In spite of the recent growth of artificial silk production and the resulting demand for machinery, John Hetherington & Sons, Ltd., the textile machinery manufacturers, lament the "deplorably intense competition in the textile machinery industry." (See 1928 Annual Report, "Observer," May 12th, 1929.)

The truth is that unemployment is a feature of Capitalism as such, and cannot be solved in one industry or country while Capitalism remains. So long as the Capitalist class own and control the factories, the land, the railways, the cinemas and so forth, they will continue to operate them for profit. They will continue to decide when to have them working and when to close them down. They will decide how many men they will employ and they will go on under the pressure of home and foreign competition reducing costs by installing labour-saving machinery and thus adding to the army of unemployed.

So great is the wealth of the possessing class that their necessities, their luxuries and their charitable gifts leave them with a vast and increasing surplus out of income which they must needs re-invest. The productivity of the wealth-producers increases more rapidly than the spending of the Capitalist class. Goods are left unsold, and more and more wealth is re-invested, thus further increasing the volume of production.

Constantly more wealth is turned out by fewer workers, and the unemployed are compelled to fall back on private and State charity for their subsistence.

No "remedy" for unemployment is worth considering which leaves untouched the private ownership and control of the means of production and distribution, and leaves the workers dependent for their livelihood on the possibility of goods being sold

at a price profitable to their masters. The Socialist remedy is the common ownership of the means and instruments for producing wealth, and the production of goods for the use of the members of society in place of production for sale and private profit.

There is no other solution of the unemployment problem. H.

THE ECONOMICS OF "OIL."

Winston was right after all when he stated recently that the workers have more "amenities" now than ever before. If any of our readers are still sceptical regarding this fact, the cutting below from the "Daily Herald" (May 11th), taken from the report of the Chairman at the Annual General Meeting of the Margarine Union, Ltd., will dissipate any doubts on the matter:—

He mentioned that over £1,600,000 had been spent on advertising during 1928 and had been fully charged to Profit and Loss. The consumption of margarine was continually increasing, no doubt due to the fact that it occupied a rather unique position, because whilst being one of the cheapest and best food commodities in existence, it was sold at the same price to the public as before the war.

And yet there are still workers who do not know on which side their bread is BUTTERED.

SARCASTICATOR.

YOUR Newsagent can obtain this journal from
Wholesale Agents: W. H. Smith & Son, Strand
House, W.C.

S.P.G.B. PROPAGANDA MEETINGS

LONDON DISTRICT.

- | | |
|-----------------------|---|
| Sunday ... | Clapham Common, 6.30 p.m.
Tottenham, West Green Corner, 11.30 a.m.
Tooting, Garrett Lane, Tooting Broadway, 7.30 p.m.
Victoria Park, 4 p.m.
Woolwich, Beresford Square, 7.30 p.m.
Hyde Park, 11.30 a.m.
Paddington, Prince of Wales, 8 p.m. |
| Mondays ... | Paddington, Prince of Wales, 8 p.m.
Clerkenwell, Gurnault Place, 8 p.m. |
| Wednesdays ... | Forest Gate Station, 8 p.m.
Paddington, Prince of Wales, 8 p.m. |
| Thursdays ... | Becontree, Rodney Street, Ilford, 8 p.m. |
| Fridays .. | Clerkenwell, Acton St., Grays Inn Rd., 8 p.m.
Hackney, Paragon Road and Mare Street, 8 p.m. |
| Saturdays ... | Wood Green, Jolly Butchers Hill, 8 p.m.
Leyton, Corner Grange Park, 7.30 p.m. |

HANLEY BRANCH.

- | | |
|--------------------|--|
| Sundays ... | Hanley Market Square, 7 p.m.
Burslem, St. John Square, 7 p.m. |
|--------------------|--|

BRANCH DIRECTORY.

- BATTERSEA.**—Sec., 9, Hanbury-road, S.W.11. Branch meets Thursday, 8.30 p.m. at The Waiting Room, Latchmere Baths, entrance in Burns-road. Discussion second Thurs. in month.
- BECONTREE.**—Sec., Hy. Gratton, 4, Drummond Ave., Brooklands, Romford. Branch meets 1st and 3rd Wednesdays at 7.30, at above address.
- BIRMINGHAM.**—Sec. E. Jesper, 88, Rollason-rd., Erdington. Branch meets The Continental Café, Moor St., 1st and 3rd Sundays at 11 a.m.
- CAMBERWELL.**—Branch meets at Camberwell Trades Council Room, 6A, Artichoke Place, Camberwell Green, every Friday at 8.30 p.m. Discussions—public invited. Letters to Secretary at above address.
- CENTRAL.**—Membership obtained only through the Ex. Committee. Applications to General Sec.
- CLERKENWELL.**—Branch meets Wednesdays, 8 p.m., at Emily Davison Club Rooms, 144, High Holborn (corner of Bury Street). Discussions first Wednesday in month at 8 p.m.—all invited. Sec., at above address.
- EAST LONDON.**—Sec., D. Jacobs, 28, Lyal Road, Bow, E.8. Branch meets 1st and 3rd Mondays at 8 p.m. at Stewart's Cafe, 195, Cambridge Rd., E.2.
- GLASGOW.**—Sec. J. C. Walker, 43, Glamis Rd., E.
- HACKNEY.**—Branch meets Arcadian Cafe, 42, Amherst Road, Hackney, Mondays, 8 p.m., Discussions 9.30. Communication to Sec. as above.
- HANLEY.**—Branch meets Tuesdays, Working Men's Club, Glass-st. Sec., F. Goldstraw, 38, Paddock Street, Hanley.
- ISLINGTON.**—Branch meets Wednesdays, 8.30, at 144, Seven Sister-rd., Holloway, N. Sec., A. Gregory, 24, Gooding Rd., N.7.
- LEYTON.**—Sec., 396, Lea Bridge-rd., Leyton. Branch meets 8 p.m., Trades and Labour Hall, Grove House, High-rd., second Mondays in month.
- MANCHESTER.**—Sec., W. Addison, 111, West Park-street, Salford, Manchester.—Branch meets 1st and 3rd Thursdays in month, 7.45 p.m.
- PADDINGTON.**—Branch meeting held on 2nd and 4th Fridays, 8 p.m., in room above the Co-operative Stores, 306, Kilburn-lane, W.9 (side door).
- SOUTHEND-ON-SEA.**—Sec., J. Bird, 5 Welling-ton-avenue, Westcliffe-on-Sea.
- TOOTING.**—Sec., Miss N. Fairbrother, 36, Haverhill Road, S.W.12. Branch meets every Friday at 8 p.m. at Tooting Adult School, 971, Garratt-lane, S.W.17.
- TOTTENHAM.**—Secretary, 18, Woodlands Park Rd., N.15. Branch meets Fridays, Room 2, Trades Hall, 7, Bruce Grove. Discussion after branch business. Public invited.
- WALTHAMSTOW.**—Sec., S. E. Williams, 64, Bloxham-rd., Leyton, E.10. Branch meets at Workmen's Hall, High-st., every Monday.
- WATFORD.**—A. Lawson, Sec., 107 Kensington-avenue, Watford. Branch meets Mondays at 8.30 p.m. at Secretary's address.

WEST HAM.—Branch meets Thursdays at 8 p.m. at 167 Romford rd., Stratford. Sec., P. Hallard, 23, Colegrave-rd., Stratford, E.

WOOD GREEN.—All communications to Sec., F. W. Godfrey, 71, Falkland Road, N.8.

WOOLWICH.—Branch meets at 94, Griffin Road, Plumstead. Communications to Secretary at above address.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN.

OBJECT.—The establishment of a system of society based upon the common ownership and democratic control of the means and instruments for producing and distributing wealth by and in the interests of the whole community.

DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great HOLDS— Britain

That society as at present constituted is based upon the ownership of the means of living (i.e., land, factories, railways, etc.) by the capitalist or master class, and the consequent enslavement of the working class by whose labour alone wealth is produced.

That in society, therefore, there is an antagonism of interests, manifesting itself as a class struggle, between those who possess but do not produce and those who produce but do not possess.

That this antagonism can be abolished only by the emancipation of the working class from the domination of the master class, by the conversion into the common property of society of the means of production and distribution, and their democratic control by the whole people.

That as in the order of social evolution the working class is the last class to achieve its freedom, the emancipation of the working class will involve the emancipation of all mankind, without distinction of race or sex.

That this emancipation must be the work of the working class itself.

That as the machinery of government, including the armed forces of the nation, exists only to conserve the monopoly by the capitalist class of the wealth taken from the workers, the working class must organise consciously and politically for the conquest of the powers of government, national and local, in order that this machinery, including these forces, may be converted from an instrument of oppression into the agent of emancipation and the overthrow of privilege, aristocratic and plutocratic.

That as political parties are but the expression of class interests, and as the interest of the working class is diametrically opposed to the interests of all sections of the master class, the party seeking working-class emancipation must be hostile to every other party.

The SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain, therefore, enters the field of political action determined to wage war against all other political parties, whether alleged labour or avowedly capitalist, and calls upon the members of the working class of this country to muster under its banner to the end that a speedy termination may be wrought to the system which deprives them of the fruits of their labour, and that poverty may give place to comfort, privilege to equality, and slavery to freedom.

Those agreeing with the above principles and desiring enrolment in the Party should apply for membership form to secretary of nearest branch or at Head Office.

THE Socialist Standard

The Official Organ of **THE SOCIALIST PARTY** of Great Britain.

No. 299. Vol. 25.]

LONDON, JULY, 1929.

[MONTHLY, TWOPENCE]

THE STRIKE AND THE VOTE.

Although Socialists do not exaggerate the importance of a General Election, much amusement and instruction may be derived from a consideration of the antics of the various parties involved. At the time of writing the Conservative leaders are endeavouring to insinuate into the minds of the workers that their position would have been much more favourable had several millions of them not participated in the so-called general strike of 1926.

That Strike was directly responsible for the loss of trade and consequent failure of the unemployed to evaporate; the Labour leaders were responsible for the Strike, and have thus contributed to the sufferings of the workers.

Thus argue the Tories.

Of course, the leaders of the Labour Party resent this attack upon their respectability.

Us responsible for the Strike? Perish the thought! It was the wicked Tory Government which provoked it by refusing to continue negotiations.

The argument never goes beneath the surface. It would not suit the interests of either party that it should do so. The strike was a fiasco from the workers' viewpoint. It certainly did leave their position worse than before; but neither Tories nor Labour leaders are concerned with pointing out why the fiasco occurred.

Each party disclaims responsibility, in order to retain the confidence of their electoral supporters, the majority of whom are members of the working class; and ignores the fact that this very confidence was a contributory factor to the overwhelming defeat which the workers sustained. The rank and file trusted their leaders on the General Council, and the Council trusted Baldwin.

The strike arose, as most strikes do, out of the antagonistic interests of the workers and their exploiters. It was the belated reply to a prolonged process of wage reductions which, in turn, followed upon the collapse of the demand for war materials, and the flooding of the labour market with discharged soldiers, munition workers, etc. The argument that the strike is the cause of the aggravated misery of the workers is thus a clear case of putting the cart before the horse.

That the workers failed to accomplish their objects in striking (which were modest enough) was due to the superior organisation of the master class, the better understanding that class has of its material interests, and its grip of the political power of the State. These factors were clearly in evidence throughout the episode.

The workers are not yet organised on the basis of their class; they have a very imperfect knowledge of their position, and their political activity is restricted to supporting different groups of leaders. The steady deterioration of their conditions of life is ample evidence of the futility of this policy, and clear proof of the need for Socialist knowledge, organisation and action.

The open champions of the master class can afford to indulge in gloating over the helplessness of their victims, because they have taken the measure of their pretended opponents. The attitude of the Labour leaders during the war, their readiness to take office in 1924, their grovelling dependence upon negotiations prior to the strike, all testify to the weakness in the workers' ranks.

The Socialist Party exists for the pur-

pose of replacing that weakness with strength; it seeks to substitute knowledge for ignorance, organisation for chaos, a steady class advance for sectional rout. Of what value are the strike and the vote in this process?

Historically, the strike preceded the vote as a weapon of the workers. In the early days of capitalism it was the only means they possessed of placing any limit to their oppression by their capitalist masters. By jointly withholding their commodity, i.e., their power to labour, they managed to obtain its value in the shape of a subsistence wage. They showed their employers that it was as easy to play for nothing as to work for nothing. In doing this, however, they exhausted the value of the strike.

They could not stop the onward march of the machine. Where, here and there, they eliminated competition between themselves, and secured a higher subsistence level, there stepped in the mechanical force which rendered many of them superfluous, and brought wages down again to a point consistent with normal profit-making.

True, so long as the wages and profits system lasts no section of the workers can afford to abandon the strike, but it is equally true that the strike holds out no possibility of solving the problem of working-class servitude. Many of our political and industrial opponents claim that the "day-to-day struggle," i.e., the succession of strikes and lock-outs, leads of itself to the workers' emancipation, and they point to the widening of the circle of the strike as evidence.

The fiasco of the "general" strike refutes the argument. Then, if ever, it should have been proved sound; but instead of an advance, we witnessed a demoralising retreat; not even an orderly one, with the enemy held at any point, but wholesale rout.

So long as the workers in the main regard their affairs from the so-called "immediate" standpoint, a continuance of the rout is inevitable. The nationalisation of industry under the control of the financiers, knocks the last nail in the coffin of orthodox trades unionism as a fighting force; and "minority" trades unionism is in no better case.

The "immediate" interests of the workers are invariably special or sectional

interests. A given rate of wages or set of hours has a different value in different industries and areas. Even the Communists have at last awakened to this fact sufficiently to "demand" a six-hours day for miners, as distinct from seven for other trades; but it is clear that no general programme of immediate demands can take into account the total variations in the workers' conditions. To have any real use the demands of any section of the workers for modifications of their conditions under capitalism must be framed by the section itself.

The political party of the workers can only express the *general* interests; the interests the workers have in common, irrespective of local or industrial variations; in other words, the interests of their class as a *whole*. As such it stands for solidarity between the different sections and the rendering of mutual support wherever possible in the defensive warfare waged by means of strikes. Its special function, however, is to point out the limited value of this warfare, and to emphasize the fact that the fight carried on along these lines only is a losing one.

So long as the workers are content to struggle for a subsistence wage only, that is the most they will obtain, with their security growing ever less. The Socialist Party summons them to struggle for possession of the means of life. Instead of voting sectionally every now and again for a cessation of work, we counsel the workers to vote as a class for the abolition of the system whereby they are compelled to work for the profit of a few, the present owners of the means of life.

Instead of voting first for this party and then for that in the effort to secure the improvement which strikes have failed to achieve, we call upon them to organise to obtain control of the political machinery, which has served their masters so effectively.

In Queensland (Australia) the workers have recently turned out a "Labour" Government merely in order to put a "Nationalist" Party in its place, thus exploding the fallacy recently held in Communist circles that the return of a Labour Party to power was the essential preliminary to the success of the Communists. The pursuit of red-herrings merely leads to apathy, re-action and despair.

Socialist education is the only solvent of working-class difficulties. When the workers realise that, in spite of all the differences in their respective conditions, they are one as slaves, then only will they feel the need and possibility of emancipation, and act accordingly. E. B.

THE AUSTRALIAN CENSORSHIP.

In the February issue we referred to the action of the Australian Government in drawing up a list of journals (including the "Socialist Standard") whose import into Australia was prohibited. We have been informed that supplies of the February and March issues, addressed to distributors in Melbourne, have been held up by the Australian Customs authorities. We have written to the authorities responsible for this seizure, and await their reply.

Those who understand the part played by material conditions in moulding men's ideas will derive considerable amusement from the spectacle of a ruling class stupidly and petulantly trying to suppress comment on the social problems which are the product of the capitalist system. They delude themselves into the belief that by suppressing discussion of a problem they have abolished the problem. They have the power to bar out our printed criticisms but they do not prove our views to be wrong in the only conclusive way, which is to abolish unemployment, poverty, etc. Rather less intelligent than the proverbial ostrich, which is said to bury its own head in order not to see approaching dangers, they act on the child-like assumption that the unemployed and poverty-stricken Australian workers will not know that they are unemployed and poverty-stricken, unless they first read about it in the "Socialist Standard." Oh, these first-class brains! ED. COMM.

NOW ON SALE.

MANIFESTO THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN.

Sixth Edition—With New Preface.

Price 2d.

Post Free, 2½d.

An Armoury of facts exposing the Labour Party, I.L.P. and similar "Labour Organisations."

POINTS FOR PROPAGANDISTS.

MR. LLOYD GEORGE SUMS UP.

In an address to the Liberal M.P.'s, delivered at the National Liberal Club on June 13th (See "Manchester Guardian," June 14th, 1929), Mr. Lloyd George gave his view on the position of the Labour Government. Apart from the obvious incorrectness of his statement that the Labour Party is pledged to destroy Capitalism, his summing up is worth noting.

We shall await with considerable interest the forthcoming declarations of Ministerial policy, but we must declare that as far as lies in our power the mandate of the Government ends when it fails to pursue a Liberal policy.

The very hour the Ministry decides to become a Socialist Administration its career ends, for it has no authority from the nation to embark upon Socialistic experiments. It could only then be kept in power by Tory votes or Tory indulgence. It will be an interesting Parliament, but there will be no more edifying spectacle than that of a Socialist Government engaged in strengthening and perpetuating the economic system their party is pledged to destroy and fortifying that system in the most effective way by carrying through a series of reforms that will remove the evils of that system—a truly Liberal performance. (Cheers.)

It only needs to be pointed out that their own past experience ought to have convinced the Liberals, as Mr. Lloyd George himself has admitted, that evils multiply under Capitalism faster than the reforms which are intended to palliate them. The condition of the workers in 1914, after many years of Liberal reforms, was not anything to cheer about.

THE I.L.P. IN PARLIAMENT.

The "New Leader," of June 14th, tells us that, including 37 Labour M.P.'s whose candidature the I.L.P. financed, "over 200 of the members of the Parliamentary party belong to the I.L.P." This is more than 70 per cent., which represents a higher percentage than in the last Parliament, or in the 1924 Parliament. Its significance lies in the fact that it makes the I.L.P. fully responsible for every action and policy of the present Labour Government. The selection of the officials of the Parliamentary Labour Party including its leader Mr. MacDonald, the policies of that body, and all the measures supported by the Labour Party in the House, can be brought home to the I.L.P., since its members are in the clear

majority and can by their votes elect what officials they like and pursue what policy they like.

The same was true in 1924, but by some subtle reasoning the I.L.P. officially tried and still tries to repudiate responsibility for the acts of its members who constitute the majority of the Parliamentary Labour Party.

In actual fact, if the I.L.P. tried to control the actions of its members in Parliament it would find itself completely unable to do so. Since every single one of them owes his or her election to Labour votes and the backing of the Labour Party and the Trade Unions, the Labour Party is in a position, if it wishes, to compel the I.L.P. M.P.'s to do its bidding and in a conflict of policies to repudiate their own I.L.P. programme and Conference decisions. While claiming that its object is Socialism, the I.L.P. has been built up by recruiting members on non-Socialist issues, and by securing the election of its members to Parliament on non-Socialist programmes supported by non-Socialist votes and financed by money from non-Socialist trade unionists and others. Outwardly an imposing and powerful body, it is in fact utterly impotent to support a Socialist policy or to carry on Socialist propaganda.

A CASE IN POINT.

This has been very clearly illustrated by the I.L.P. Conference decision on War-credits. At the 1929 Conference (reported in the "New Leader," April 5th) a resolution was passed, after a short discussion, by 160 to 125, "instructing all I.L.P. M.P.'s to vote again War-credits."

Mr. Shinwell, M.P. (who is not only a member of the I.L.P. but is also financed by them at elections), promptly protested and declared that whatever Conference might decide he would act just how his electors pleased.

I say, quite frankly, as an I.L.P. member, I will take any decision that requires to be taken from my constituency and not from this Conference.

The officials of the I.L.P. knew quite well that other M.P.'s would follow Shinwell's example, for the simple reason that to carry out Conference instructions would lose them Labour Party support and consequently their seats. When someone

challenged Mr. Maxton to show courage, he replied:—

If I were to come to you at the next Conference and tell you that there were only half-a-dozen I.L.P. M.P.'s left, and that they were out of the General Labour Movement, would you call that courage or folly?—"Daily Herald," April 3rd.)

A way out was therefore soon found. As soon as Mr. Maxton and others indicated the difficulty which would certainly arise if the I.L.P. tried to compel its members to abide by its policy, the Standing Orders Committee recommended, and Conference agreed, that the Chairman (Mr. Maxton) be given, "discretionary powers in applying to-day's decision." The sequel is amusing and instructive. Mr. Shinwell has been made Financial Secretary of the War Office in the Labour Government. Other I.L.P. Members of Parliament may be expected to take this lesson to heart.

* * *

COMMUNISTS NOT A WORKING-CLASS PARTY.

We have often pointed out that the principles and policies of the Communist Parties are not in line with the interests of the working class. Mr. Saklatvala, writing a May Day message in the "Sunday Worker" (April 28th), put this beyond question. He wrote:—

But we must remember on our platforms that our slogan is now no longer merely "Proletarians of all countries, unite!" but "Proletarians and oppressed peoples of all countries, unite!"

Not only textile workers in Bombay and Calcutta, miners in India and China, and steel smelters in Bengal, but millions of oppressed peasants in India, China, Egypt, and the African colonies are now with us in our fight against the common enemies of imperialism and reformist Labour.

Behind that innocent-looking but conveniently ambiguous word, "peoples," the Communists carry on their anti-working class campaign in support of the Indian, Egyptian, Irish and other Capitalist nationalists. Those struggles are struggles between sections of the Capitalist class and victory either way is of no gain to the workers. The Indian workers will learn, as the Irish have learned, that Capitalism administered by native Capitalists is not essentially different from Capitalism administered by Britishers.

CAPITALISM IN RUSSIA.

It is one of the delusions of the I.L.P. that Capitalism ceases to be Capitalism where it is administered by people calling themselves "Labour." An equally pathetic delusion is held by the British Communists with regard to Russia. A correspondent, writing to the "Sunday Worker" (June 9th), held this common but mistaken view. He argued that the wages system in Russia cannot be called "Wage-slavery" because the terms of employment are "dictated by the workers' government." It is true enough that the Bolsheviks would like to abolish Capitalism if conditions allowed, but conditions do not allow. What they have been able to do is to foster the growth of State Capitalism and limit the growth of private Capitalism, thus following the example of Australia. But from the worker's point of view the difference is little. Capitalism is based on the exploitation of the workers, whatever form that exploitation may take. In Russia there is a new and rapidly growing Capitalist class drawing property incomes from private trading, and from investments in the Co-operatives and the Russian State Loans.

In the Co-operatives the total share and reserve capital amounted in 1927 to £97 million. (See Soviet Union Year Book, 1928—P. 183.) While in October, 1926, Credits borrowed at home and abroad by the Co-operatives amounted to 108 million Roubles. (Ibid—P. 193.) The rate of interest is not given.

But the most important form of Russian Capitalism is the new National Debt.

Since 1925, State loans in Russia have been used exclusively for financing industry. (See Soviet Union Year Book—P. 394.) Between October, 1925, and February 1st, 1929, the total debt grew from 367 million Roubles to 1,983 million Roubles, or nearly £200 million. (See Review of the Bank of Russian Trade a Soviet Bank publication, May, 1929.)

The interest rates on these loans vary from 5 per cent. to 12 per cent., and must average not less than 10 per cent.

In addition, there is a "floating debt," whose amount is unspecified.

The land in Russia is privately worked for private profit, and the new Capitalist class of investors have first claim on the proceeds of the State factories, railways,

etc. Russia has the usual features of Capitalism. Not only are the means of production privately owned but inequality also exists, as it is bound to. Hence the introduction by the Soviet Government of a graduated Income Tax, Excess Profits Tax and Inheritance duties.

When the writer in the "Sunday Worker" states that in Russia the terms of employment are dictated by the Workers' Government, he forgets that conditions compel the Government to make those terms such as will permit the Capitalist system to function and develop. H.

THE CAPITALIST SYSTEM: HOW IT WORKS.

The following is taken from the "Daily Telegraph" (Wednesday, May 22nd). It tells its own story. The italics are ours:—

From Our Own Correspondent.

NEW YORK, Tuesday.

The owners of America's surplus wheat crop, it is estimated, to-day will have to face a loss of more than £11,000,000 unless the price of the commodity rises substantially before the new crop is harvested.

Two big crops in succession have left the world "gorged" with wheat, and with the prospects of another full crop this year the price has fallen until it threatens to break through the four shillings a bushel level.

The world's carry-over of wheat at the beginning of the new marketing year on July 1 is expected to be 350,000,000 bushels, or about double the amount on hand last year. The major portion of this amount is in the hands of middlemen, who will bear the brunt of the reduced prices. But the large carry-over is likely to continue to have a depressing influence upon the grain market. In that case it will be difficult for the American farmer to dispose of his new crop at a fair profit.

The only hope, apparently, is for a poor harvest, and of this there are no indications at present.

TRAFALGAR SQUARE DEMONSTRATION.

We greatly regret that the Demonstration arranged for Sunday, June 9th, and advertised in the "Socialist Standard," had to be cancelled. Speakers who had undertaken to address the Demonstration reported their inability to attend, but it was then too late to make other satisfactory arrangements. Efforts were made to advise as many of our readers as possible.

"CAPITAL."**A CRITICISM OF THE NEW TRANSLATION.**

We publish below an interesting letter which was addressed to the "Labour Monthly" by Professor Riazanoff, and published in its May issue.

THE NEW TRANSLATION OF MARX.**A LETTER FROM PROFESSOR RIAZANOV.**

Dear Comrade,—In your last letter you mentioned the new translation of "Capital" by E. and C. Paul*. The book, peculiar as it may seem, has not been a pleasure to me. Of course, it is agreeable to find the demand for the works of Marx having become so great as to require a new edition of the "Capital," and as a sign of this increased interest in Marx and his works I certainly welcome this edition. Only my pleasure has been marred by the circumstance that one has found it necessary to make an entirely new translation instead of revising the edition of Moore and Aveling, which had been thoroughly revised and completed by Engels.

Both translators of the first English edition were born Englishmen, both were quite conversant with economical matters and even if to them has to be denied an all-round competence in questions of economy, nothing of the kind can be said against Engels, who, as is to be seen from letters of that period, also from his introduction to the English edition, has spent an enormous deal of time and labour on this edition. This old edition contains a tremendous deal of Engels' own work, and I do not consider it right to neglect this work; and what is more, to me it is not a neglect only, but equals almost to a contempt, to an abjudication of Engels, and with such a tendency I, of course, cannot at all sympathise.

I do not consider myself so competent as to declare decisively that the edition revised by Engels complies to all stylistical requirements, or that it contains no mistakes, no errors. Its containing mistakes is quite possible. But to justify the discarding of the text authorised by Engels, the least one ought to have done would have been to prove on hand of numerous instances the

* Capital. A new translation by Eden and Cedar Paul, based on the Fourth and Definitive Edition. (Allen & Unwin, 927 pp., 12s. 6d.)

absolute uselessness of the old English edition, the impossibility of adapting it to the requirements of to-day and hence its inevitable fate of being thrown away in order to make room to a completely new translation. To such an authority as Engels this justification, to my idea, ought to have been made!

I have not gone through the Pauls' translation very thoroughly, but the fact of this translation suffering from serious errors was brought home to me by the introduction of the Pauls, from which I learned that they have not used for their text the "Volksausgabe," published by Kautsky (and to which I also contributed by adding a very complete register).

This Kautsky edition, though not a critical definite one, possesses great advantages over all other editions as far as the text is concerned, as Kautsky has used for this edition all the variations of the four different versions by Marx or Engels, further numerous corrections of Marx and Engels' found in their own copies, and also the French edition, which to a great extent had been revised by Marx. From all this is to be seen that the Pauls have not made use of the best text hitherto known, therefore their translation is a step backwards.

A hasty perusal of their book resulted in my discovering the following errors:—

- On page 866 instead of "hoffnungsvoll" (hopeful) they translated unhappy.
- " 282 instead of "Arbeitsvolk" (working people) they translated the French people.
- " 318 instead of "Arbeitszeit" (labour time) they translated labour power.
- " 552 instead of "Lehrfabrik" (factory for learning) they translated tannery.
- " 593 instead of "politische Oekonomie" (political economy) they translated English economics.

In conclusion, let me say that as long as E. and C. Paul do not convince me by a thorough criticism of the old translation that a revision (the necessity of which I do not deny) has been absolutely impossible, I maintain and shall continue to maintain the standpoint of considering their new translation from a scientific point of view superfluous. The interest of the English speaking world in Marx's "Capital" will grow to such an extent that I hope the day will not be far off when the opportunity arises of re-editing the old translation.

Fraternally yours,
Moscow, April 18, 1929. D. RIAZANOV.

SOCIALIST BREVITIES.**A LIFE ON THE OCEAN WAVE—
UNDER CAPITALISM.**

I am afraid that, like many other people, no doubt, my conception of sailors has been coloured by the familiar picture which adorns Mr. Angus Watson's sardine tins. I have never doubted that our sailors were boys of the bull-dog, and not the whippet breed. But this conviction has been sadly shaken by the following news item, which appeared in the "Daily News" (11/1/29):

Sharp criticism of the seaman's working conditions is being expressed by Mr. Ernest Bevin, general secretary of the Transport Workers' Union, and the officials of the Marine Section of that body.

These conditions, it is alleged, are responsible for the highest death-rate of any class of workers.

In this week's issue of the "Seafarers' Record," published by the Union, a comparison is made between the air space of the living and sleeping quarters of sailors, and that of workhouse inmates and convicts.

The legal minimum allotment of space to the sailor is 120 cubic feet, but it is stated that the locker and fittings deprive the occupant of 32 cubic feet, giving only 88 feet net.

The space given to a workhouse inmate is 400 cubic feet, and to a convict 800 feet.

Mr. Bevin contends that official figures—showing death-rates much more serious than among miners—do not indicate the full difference, as many sailors leave the ships when they are ill, work for a time in some shore job associated with shipping and dock work, and are not necessarily classed as mariners when they die from the illness contracted at sea.

Mr. James Henson, who contributes an article on the subject, quotes an official statement that seamen's mortality exceeds the average by 48.8 per cent., while the death rate from accident is 430 per cent. higher.

Mr. Henson adds that for every 112 miners who die of tuberculosis there are 221 deaths of sailors from the same cause.

It is stated that on many ships the bunks are occupied by relays of men, and that the air is constantly foul. Liability to tuberculosis is attributed mainly to this condition.

Tribute is paid to one or two British ship-owners who have greatly improved the sailor's accommodation in ships built since the war. But it is alleged that the British standard is much below the average of American, Dutch, Scandinavian, and some other foreign vessels.

The Transport Workers' Union intends to start a vigorous campaign.

It would appear that when our sailors are not "going down to the sea in ships," they are going down to the tubercular ward of the Infirmary in an ambulance!

SOME "INDEPENDENCE"!

The "Daily News" for February 15th contains a contribution to the Sex Equality Debate by Mrs. Eva M. Hubback, who is prominent in the National Union of Societies for Equal Citizenship. Among the feminist arguments put forward we get this gem:—

The married women of to-day, therefore, except for the comparatively few with estates and incomes of their own, are entirely dependent on (a) their husband's power; (b) his will to maintain them adequately. What is the result? It is that her income and the sum she has to satisfy the needs of her children are measured—not as in any other profession by her ability, and by the requirements of her job—but by her husband's ability and employment, or lack of it.

Nowhere is there any other profession where rewards are in this way totally divorced from either services or needs.

Thus a first-rate mother with half a dozen children, whose husband is a labourer and perhaps unemployed at that, will be engaged in the hopeless task of making bricks without straw, and of trying to carry on her home making and child-rearing duties on a totally inadequate income.

And the proposed remedy? Now look serious, the remedy is:—

That a wife should be given a share in her husband's income.

!!! Let us hope that when the wife gets a share of what is left over after the unemployment pay has been divided amongst eight persons, she will not expend her stupendous portion at night clubs, but will put it by so as to be able to leave the price of a packet of woodbines to her progeny.

SARCASTIGATOR

CORRECTION.

In the middle of column two, page 156, of the June "S.S.," four lines below the sub-heading, "What shall we do with the Bank Clerks," the word "ledger posters," appears incorrectly as "ledger-porters."

NOW ON SALE!

A Reprint of the Second Edition

OF

"Socialism and Religion."

This unique Party Pamphlet is now reprinted at a price within the reach of all.

48 pages. TWOPENCE. 2½d. post free.

OFFICIAL NOTICE.

All communications for the Executive Committee, Subscriptions for the SOCIALIST STANDARD, Articles, and Correspondence submitted for insertion therein, should be addressed—The Socialist Party of Great Britain, 42, Great Dover Street, London, S.E.1, to whom Money Orders should be made payable.

The meetings of the Executive Committee are held at the Head Office, every Tuesday, at 7.30 p.m.

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTIONS.

Twelve Months, post free... .. 2s. 6d.
Six Months, post free... .. 1s. 3d.

The Socialist Standard,

JULY,



1929

THE NEW ERA!

The Labour Government is in office, their photos are in the papers, silk hats and all. The Cabinet is composed of respectable, nice, kind men—we know that, because the papers have told us so. They have started work—we know that because the papers have exhibited photos of them in typical working attitudes—gazing at piles of papers, holding telephones to their ears, etc., etc. We admit that, from the photos, there is nothing to choose between them and their predecessors. They look just as happy and satisfied.

When they were last in power we did not notice any striking change in the general position of the workers. We can confidently prophecy that "history will repeat itself" with slight modifications. What will you, fellow-worker, do then? Will you vote Liberal or Tory next time? Or will you get down to the job of understanding just where you are?

You are poor because you are deprived of the things you produce—because you keep drones to exploit you. You will remain poor until you put an end to exploitation.

Do those smirking, self-satisfied faces that look at you out of the newspapers

represent a movement that is going to lift you out of wage-slavery? The movement for Socialism is a serious business, born out of the miseries and enslavement of the multitude; it demands of its votaries hard work, political sincerity, and steadfastness of purpose. It is not a movement to provide an opportunity for brilliant oratory, "statesmanship," swell dinners or joy-rides, nor is it a movement to provide a poor man, with a clever tongue, a ladder to climb out of oppressive conditions at the expense of his fellows.

You have voted into power a Labour Government. You, who are poor, have not done this to amuse yourselves, you have done it in the expectation that your conditions will be ameliorated. Watch the progress of your new Government, see if their acts provide you with any road out of poverty. And when you are disappointed, as you surely will be, do not then sink back into apathy and dejection, but examine again your position in society. If you do this carefully you will come to the knowledge that your emancipation depends upon yourselves and can only be accomplished by yourselves.

The day that you reach this view you will turn to the party that alone has stood for Socialism throughout the whole of its history. That party is the Socialist Party of Great Britain. It is composed of working men and women who, in the course of their daily work, have gained a knowledge of Socialism and held fast to it.

Examine our position; judge us,—and join with us in the work of emancipation.

KNOWLEDGE.

The following Books can be obtained from Head Office:—

Anarchism and Socialism. Plechanoff. 3/6, paper 1/2.

Civil War in France. Marx 2/9.

Conditions of the Working Class in England in 1844. Engels. 5/-

Critique of Political Economy. Marx. 6/6.

18th Brumaire of Louis Napoleon. Marx. 3/6.

Evolution of Property. Lafargue. 3/6, limp 1/6.

Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State. Engels. 3/6.

Poverty of Philosophy. Marx. 6/6.

Revolution and Counter-Revolution. Marx. 3/6, limp 1/6.

Social and Philosophical Studies. Lafargue 3/6.

Socialism: Utopian and Scientific. Engels. 3/6, limp 1/6. *Postage extra.*

HOW NOT TO GET SOCIALISM.

Alderman Tom Kirk writes in the "Railway Review" (May 31st, 1929) an article entitled "The Revival of Socialism." The first paragraph is unimportant, but we reprint here the remainder of Mr. Kirk's article.

But here is where we draw a distinction between Socialism and Labour politics. To the Socialist there is only one thing that matters, the growth of the Socialist outlook in the public mind. It is his sole reason for being in politics at all. He perceives that you cannot make Socialists by just preaching theory. That was the dream of the old Socialist League, just as it is the dream of the Socialist Party of Great Britain. But the mind of the average man can only be reached through the current politics of the moment. In order to be with you, he wants to know what you are "going to do." And you must provide him with a plan of action, even if the action is not likely to produce much more than a growth of his Socialist convictions. We can no more escape from the illusion of politics than the early Christians, by burying themselves in the deserts of Egypt, could escape from the contamination of the world, the flesh, and the devil.

Consequently, however much the austere purists may declaim, we have got to get on with the job as we find it. Fortunately, the movement has now reached a point that we can definitely warn our supporters from expecting too much from this or that particular reform. It has been a matter of great satisfaction to note the almost complete absence of the type of speaker who promised a solution of unemployment if the workers would only "vote Labour." And in his place a stressing of the point that unemployment would not be "solved" while the capitalist system remained. It could only be ameliorated, not "solved." All this is to the good; and it is a healthy sign of the times that the boastful promises of the Liberals have been contemptuously disregarded by organised Labour, with the result that Mr. Lloyd George became exceedingly angry. On the whole, tosh and window-dressing have been at a discount at this election.

The task of making the great mass of Labour electors into Socialists still, however, remains. Nationalisation, municipalisation, and public ownership still appear too much in the mind's eye of the average workman as methods whereby he will immediately advance his wages and working conditions. Ultimately they must lead to his uplifting and betterment, otherwise they would be purposeless.

But as Hyndman used to say, "You cannot make oases of co-operation in the midst of a howling wilderness of competition." The Socialist perceives this; the mere Labour elector does not. While we do not expect a nationalised industry to "pay its way" in the capitalist sense, we cannot run it regardless of the balance

sheet. That way trouble lies; and the ending of things as they have ended in Queensland.

Then, again, what is going to be done with regard to the vast sum of British capital which is invested in foreign undertakings? The annual interest on that is responsible for a quarter of our imports. It represents about £300,000,000 annually. It is gained by exploiting the foreigner. Do we propose to take over these investments? If so, the British Labour State would become an exploiter of foreign workmen. Do we propose to leave these foreign investors to enjoy their incomes undisturbed except of such taxation as we could impose upon them? But in any case, as the £300,000,000 principally arrives here in the shape of food and raw materials, which we require for industries, we should have to do "something." All of which shows that when it comes to the real business of getting down to the establishment of Socialism we have hardly discussed the matter at all. It will be the work of Socialists in the immediate future to promote discussion on such subjects. We cannot live for ever on a mere nebulous labourism. We shall have to get back to the healthy old business of the I.L.P. and S.D.F. setting the pace. And now that Communism has become a spent squib, the possibility of such a development is apparent. The specific function of the new orientation will not be vote catching, but education of the public as to how Socialism is to be established.

THEORIES—THE TRUE AND THE FALSE.

Now to disentangle this network of Kirkian errors. Mr. Kirk professes to be a Socialist, and accuses the S.P.G.B. of being dreamers of theory. Nothing matters to Mr. Kirk but "the growth of the Socialist outlook in the public mind." But what is the "Socialist outlook" but the knowledge of Socialist theories? Therefore, Mr. Kirk is another dreamer, if to hold a theory is to be a dreamer. But the S.P.G.B. repudiates that title. We are a political organisation, and are not devotees of the cult of Utopias. We do not pray for spiritual aid to attain our ends. Our declaration of principles distinctly says, "That the Working Class must organise consciously and politically for the conquest of the powers of government, national and local, etc.," and at the elections we are prepared to put candidates for the polls. If the workers are not sufficiently class-conscious to support a Socialist candidate by supplying his deposit money, that is not our fault. Rather it is Mr. Kirk's fault, and their misfortune.

After the high-minded attitude of "nothing mattering, etc.," Mr. Kirk then says, "But the mind of the average man can only be reached through the current politics of the moment." Here is the pose of the modern Jesus soiling his hands with Party politics. The next piece is rather funny. "He (the worker) wants to know what you are going to do." So, Mr. Kirk thinks it best to present him with "a plan of action," even if it will not bring forth much more than "a growth of the workers' Socialist convictions." But we thought Mr. Kirk was a Socialist. He should, then, be more than delighted if his "plan of action" only brought forth this "growth of Socialist convictions." He, however, knows very well that it does no such thing, and only makes confusion worse confounded. The knowledge of what is meant by Socialism is essential to the making of Socialists. Mr. Kirk leaves us to infer that this "plan of action" is really only a blind to keep up "the illusion of politics." We cannot agree that politics are an illusion, but if Mr. Kirk thinks so, on what grounds can he justify his action of keeping up an illusion? I am afraid, after all, it is Mr. Kirk who has been dreaming. But to proceed. He says, "We (that is, the Labour Party) must get on with the job as we find it." That, of course, means continuing to introduce reforms and patching up the capitalist system, but then he has the audacity to say that "at the same time they must warn their supporters that they must not expect too much from it." He is pleased to notice that the Labour candidates stressed the point *during the Election* that while the Capitalist system remained they could only ameliorate unemployment, not solve it. Yes, but what happens after the ball? If they know this, why are they taking the reins of government into their hands again? And on what grounds can the Labour Party justify its existence, and Mr. Kirk his support thereof? Why does he not tell the workers that the advent of Socialism alone will solve their troubles?

Then we have Mr. Kirk bemoaning the fact that Nationalisation, etc., appears too much in the minds of the workers as a method by which they can improve their wages and working conditions. He quotes Hyndman as saying "You cannot

make oases of co-operation in a howling wilderness of competition," and says that the Socialist perceives this; the mere Labour elector does not. But who is it that propagates the idea of Nationalisation? The Labour Party, not the S.P.G.B. Yet Mr. Kirk now finds it a stumbling-block in the way of making Socialists. Oh, wonderful logic! The Socialists, to Mr. Kirk, means the I.L.P. and the Labourites. Therefore, they stand in the unenviable position of telling the workers to support a thing which they know to be unsound. Still speaking of Nationalisation, he says it must ultimately lead to the betterment of the worker, otherwise it would be "purposeless." That is just the point; it does not lead to any betterment. By making industry more efficient less workers are required, unemployment increases, and these schemes, therefore, from the point of view of the workers are worse than purposeless, they are definitely harmful. He says, "while we do not expect a nationalised industry to pay its way in the capitalist sense, we cannot run it regardless of the balance sheet. That way trouble lies, and the ending of things, as they ended in Queensland." In fact, of course, the I.L.P. advocates of Nationalisation vigorously affirm that in Queensland it did pay its way. The Queensland Labour Government failed because, as administrators of capitalism, they could not "deliver the goods" which they had promised to the workers. The workers were disillusioned, and having no knowledge of Socialism, voted once more for the capitalist class. Mr. Kirk would lead us to believe that the Queensland Government was being run by mere dreamers trying to run the finances of the country without due regard to its balance sheet. But can he show us any important difference between the Labour programme in Queensland and in this country? He wants to support the Labour Party while disassociating himself from its policies.

Mr. Kirk could not have meant to have revealed such a lot when he started, but perhaps he was counting on the "Railway Review" not being read by "Austere Purists." However, the cream of the thing is yet to come. We find poor Mr. Kirk getting concerned as to what the British Labour State (whoever that may be) would do with the interest coming

from British invested capital abroad. I am afraid we cannot tell him. You see, we are only Socialists, and we only know what Socialists would do. We must leave the British Labour State's problems for itself and Mr. Kirk to solve. "All of which shows that when it comes to the business of getting down to the establishment of Socialism we have hardly discussed the matter at all," cries Mr. Kirk.

Presumably, then, settling the destination of interest from British invested capital abroad comes within Mr. Kirk's theory of Socialism. Mr. Kirk's theories make a Socialist feel sick. Interest and capital under Socialism! A little understanding of sound, instead of unsound, theory, would greatly benefit the illustrious Alderman. Interest and profit are essentially features of capitalism; likewise is the individual owner of property. Socialism means common ownership. There would be no persons here or abroad possessing capital. The question only arises in the dreams of Mr. Kirk. It certainly has nothing to do with establishing Socialism.

THE "HEALTHY OLD BUSINESS" OF MIS-REPRESENTING SOCIALISM.

The last few sentences are a fitting end to his article. I wonder he dares mention the S.D.F. or the I.L.P. in connection with "health." Their part does not bear inspection. They have proved to be bad guides throughout to the working class. Their attitude on the War and their trickery at the elections of 1910 and 1906 respectively (see our Manifesto for facts) proves that the "healthy old business" of the precious pair is not healthy but thoroughly diseased, in fact rotten to the core.

Mrs. O.

ANSWERS TO CORRESPONDENTS

RATES AND TAXES.

Battersea, S.W.11.
June 6th, 1929.

Sir,—I have recently been reading a leaflet issued by the S.P.G.B., entitled, "Rates and Taxes: do they fall on the working class? Which states that the working class is unaffected by taxes, since they pay none.

Am I not right in assuming that the tax on wages is a tax, and that the working class *does* pay it?

I shall be pleased if you can explain this

to me; or give me the Socialist Party of Great Britain's views on the matter.

I believe the tax on wages was instituted during the War, and as the Leaflet is a reprint of an article that appeared in the "Socialist Standard" of March, 1912, the question was not dealt with.

I am, yours faithfully,

W. A. DEVINE.

OUR REPLY.

Our correspondent has misunderstood the case put forward in the Leaflet to which he refers.

In the first place, we do not deny that a few workers pay Income Tax. (The number is, however, very small. A single man does not pay Income Tax until his earnings exceed £162 a year, or £3 2s. 4d. per week. A married man without children does not pay tax until his earnings exceed £270 or £5 3s. 10d. per week. The total number of persons paying tax in Great Britain and N. Ireland is only 2,150,000. See Constitutional Year Book—P. 389).

What we are concerned with is a different question altogether, and the only one of importance. That question is: "Would the workers be better off if taxes were lower, and worse off if taxes were higher?" And the answer to both parts of the question is No!

If prices fall through the abolition of taxes on various articles, such as tea, sugar, etc., wages fall also; and the workers are no better off. When prices rise wages follow, even if somewhat tardily.

The workers, speaking broadly, receive as wages enough to buy the necessities of life for themselves and their families. If prices fall and living becomes cheaper, wages fall, too. Taxes, so far as they affect the workers at all, are part of their cost of living. An increase in these taxes will result in employers having to pay higher wages. A decrease in these taxes, which cheapens the worker's cost of living, leads to lower wages, and benefits the employers only. The question of taxation is not one which affects the workers. Our correspondent is referred to the October, 1928, issue, where the matter was dealt with.

ED. COMM.

ON EDUCATING THE WORKERS.

To the Editorial Committee.

Gentlemen,—Your much reiterated assertion that Socialism can only be brought into being by an intelligent and class-conscious working class, becomes more *seemingly* apparent as time passes. It is also very obvious that the progress of a clear understanding of their position by the working class is slow and infinitesimal in proportion to the rapid and relentless development and extension of Capitalism, which must reach its apex. What then? Must the workers endure an indefinite period of suffering whilst a small body of Socialists blandly continue that almost impossible task—education? Do you really believe that the workers *as a class* will ever accept your position? What credulity! And optimism! Incurable, too, from my experience of your party. The larger portion of the working class are steeped in superstition and bigotry of every kind, which will take centuries of education to remove. So far, among contemporary parties, you are unimportant. I assume, however, that the teaching of Socialism as taught by the S.P.G.B., will some day be more generally accepted. You will then find that you will be compelled—in order to further develop and achieve your purpose—to exploit and appeal to the emotions of the workers, religious and otherwise. In short, secure the acquiescence of the majority for your programme by any means possible.

Yours sincerely,
S.E.18. H. WATTS.

OUR REPLY.

It is difficult to understand exactly what our correspondent's criticisms are. Having told us that the task of educating the workers is "almost impossible," and that we are incurable optimists for believing it to be possible, he goes on to say, "I assume, however, that the teaching of Socialism, as taught by the S.P.G.B., will some day be more generally accepted."

It seems, therefore, that Mr. Watts really agrees with us that we shall succeed in making our views "more generally accepted."

He then makes another unsupported and contradictory assertion. Having conceded that our views will become "more generally accepted," he makes the unexplained

assumption that the methods which have been successful in making our position "more generally accepted" will fail to help us "to further develop." We can only ask him why it will be impossible for us to spread Socialist knowledge when we have grown larger and stronger, particularly as he agrees that we shall have succeeded in growing stronger by that means.

Mr. Watts' suggestion as to an alternative method is again self-contradictory. He says that we shall have to "appeal to the emotions of the workers, religious and otherwise," in order to secure "the acquiescence of the majority" for our programme. What Mr. Watts fails to see is that no amount of "appeals to emotions, religious or otherwise," would ever win support for our programme. The Declaration of Principles of the Socialist Party has no attraction whatever for the person who can still be reached by emotional appeals. Such persons will continue to support the parties whose programmes suit their lack of knowledge.

Mr. Watts tells us that the larger portion of the working class are steeped in "superstition and bigotry of every kind." Does he then really imagine that Socialism could be successfully carried on by such people, supposing (an unwarrantable supposition) that by appeals to their emotions they had been won away from supporting Capitalist parties?

Mr. Watts himself illustrates the need for Socialist knowledge, when he talks of Capitalism reaching its "apex." Even if it were true that Capitalism could be left to itself and at a certain point would collapse, there would still be need of an organised Socialist working class to tackle the work of building up Socialism. In fact, however, this theory of collapse is a piece of anti-Socialist doctrine, repudiated by Marx and Socialists generally. Capitalism will remain in being just so long as the majority accept it. And so long as the workers accept Capitalism they will have to go on suffering under it. While they accept Capitalism no minority can save them from the consequences of Capitalism.

If Mr. Watts thinks he knows a way in which a minority can lead a non-Socialist working class into Socialism, perhaps he will tell us what it is. ED. COMM.

THE MEANING OF DISARMAMENT.

Among the numerous claims and promises made by the various parties in the recent election those relating to peace and disarmament held a prominent place. During the last War, representatives of the Liberal, Labour and Tory parties held office in coalition and assumed responsibility for making the machinery of warfare as efficient as possible. They now have just sufficient contempt for the memories and intelligence of their supporters to ask them to trust them to see that there is no more war.

The emptiness of their claims and promises, however, is enhanced by recent developments in the art of warfare. The aeroplane and the chemical factory threaten to render all previous weapons obsolete. In the issue of "International Conciliation" for March, 1929 (Carnegie Endowment, 44, Portland St., Worcs., Mass., U.S.A.), sufficient evidence is provided to show that even the wholesale scrapping of armies and navies, as hitherto understood, along with tanks, battleships and other special forms of armament, would still leave in the hands of the master-class means of destruction more deadly than any yet developed. This particular issue is entitled, "Chemical Warfare—its Possibilities and Probabilities," and treats the whole subject historically and scientifically with a minimum of sentiment and an entire absence of sensationalism. The authorities for statements made are, in the main, responsible chemical and military experts, with no obvious axe to grind in scaring the populations of the world at large.

Chemical methods of attack and defence are not in themselves new. Stink bombs were used in the Middle Ages and were apparently such terrible things that an Austrian chemist suggested that "Christians should only use them against Turks and unbelievers." Even the Greeks used pots of pitch and sulphur for smoking out their enemies. Modern science and the development of Capitalist industry have, however, increased the effectiveness of this arm beyond recognition. In fact, it is (ironically enough) upon the basis of the tragic experiences of the workers engaged in the mining and chemical industries that the

knowledge of the war-time value of certain gases has been established; and it was the advanced state of these industries in Germany (not some peculiar Hunnishness) which enabled and impelled the German military command to use this knowledge. Needless to add that, in spite of Hague Conventions, the Allies were not slow in imitation.

It is this close relationship between chemical warfare and normal peace-time industry, coupled with the slight distinction between a commercial aeroplane and one adapted to military requirements, which reduces all talk of disarmament under Capitalism to sheer childish prattle. According to Brigadier-General Lord Thomson, Air Minister in the British Government:—

The next war will be fought in the air, it will consist of aeroplane raids above the great cities, and the primary attack will be against civilians, including women and children.

Against these incendiary, explosive and poison gas bombs will be used. No defence that has as yet been devised will prevent the death of thousands of persons in any city thus attacked, and the organised life of any great metropolitan centre would be brought to a standstill for days and weeks. (p. 130.)

THE HIGH COST OF KILLING.

During December, 1928, Dr. Hilton Ira Jones announced, in Chicago, the discovery of a new poison more deadly than any heretofore known, called cacodyl isacyanide.

War, he said, will never again be fought with shot and shell. It is so much cheaper to destroy life wholesale with this new gas. It may be manufactured at the rate of thousands of tons a day, and it costs much less than powder and cannon—yet it will destroy armies more quickly and effectively. (p. 140.)

In face of these developments, the workers may well ask themselves what safeguards they possess from the potential horrors of another war. So far, none of the Governments have proposed the abolition of chemical factories and aeroplanes, and judging by past experiences, their scraps of paper hold good only so long as it suits the convenience of the contracting parties to observe their provisions.

The author of the pamphlet goes so far as to make the statement on page 125, that, "Statesmen will always be powerless unless the people are awakened." She has not yet grasped the simple fact that the reverse is true, i.e., that the power of "statesmen" rests upon the political

ignorance and passivity of the major portion of the "people," the working class.

Warfare is in fact the supreme expression of the power of the modern State, and only when the workers conquer that power can they hope to put an end to warfare.

It is just here, at the crucial point, that the pamphlet fails. The author appreciates and emphasises the fact that technical disarmament is impossible in any complete sense, e.g., "the very fundamentals of our civilisation—coal, salt, air, etc., can produce poison gases" (p. 181), but can only suggest "the peaceful settlement of international disputes" (p. 189). She never attempts to deal with the causes of these disputes, or show how they are capable of peaceful settlement.

Modern states exist because of the conflict of interests in modern society. This conflict is due to the capitalist ownership of the economic resources of society. The international capitalist class is divided into competing groups endeavouring to secure control of the raw materials, trade routes and markets of the world. The most powerful of these groups use the machinery of the various States as weapons in the struggle. Two factors enable them to do this: their control of the States in question, backed up by the unconscious political support of the workers in the various countries.

It is not only in conflict with each other, however, that the capitalist groups are prepared to use lethal weapons. In all these conflicts they sacrifice the lives of the workers, and it is against the workers in the last resort that the modern States are armed.

The workers are a propertyless class, and constitute a standing menace to the security of property.

The State is the guardian of the interests of property against the producers.

Among the "peace-time" uses of poison gases the author mentions the following: "Tear gases, such as chloracetophenone, can be used on mobs, escaping jailbirds and other trouble-stirring individuals" (p. 180), thus clearly recognising that it is against its own subjects, as well as against external enemies, that the State needs arms.

The solution of the conflict lies not with

an amorphous "people" but with a working-class, organised to emancipate itself, internationally. In the place of capitalism, with its economic chaos and political strife, it will establish a social order based upon the common ownership of the means of life and their democratic control in the interests of a class-less community. E. B.

ASPECTS OF THE "WOMAN QUESTION."

(Based on Notes of a Series of Lectures on "The Sexes in Evolution.")

In the present state of our knowledge of biological matters, no fact is more patent than that sex constitutes one of the greatest underlying principles throughout Nature.

Students of evolution will appreciate the fact that sex, like any other biological feature, has undergone a progressive evolutionary development—a development exhibiting many phases, both simple and complex—until we arrive at what is termed its "highest expression," that of the human male and female.

Much of the course of this development is known, but the question of the origin of sex itself still remains one of the puzzling problems of biology. Certain it is that there was a time when what we know as "sex" did not exist. In many "lowly" organisms this condition of sexlessness obtains to-day. But at one stage in the development of living forms this condition was universal. By and bye there came a differentiation in the development of organisms, which resulted in a division of labour, where the special functions of each were confined to two separate and distinct individuals. From this point the independent history of the male and female sexes begins. Probably from the time of the appearance of life on the earth to that of the establishment of separate sexes, millions of years intervened. And probably, also, from the time that sex first made its appearance, millions more have elapsed. How and why sex differentiation came about at all is problematical. In all likelihood some crisis arose which threatened the existence of the particular species in which the phenomenon first occurred, and which had its appropriate physiological response in the organism, resulting in a

division of labour, for, fundamentally, male and female are the same in biological essentials, the difference being some subtle biochemical quality whose essence is not quite understood.

We pass on, then, to the rise of the human animal where this sex differentiation concerns us most. They, like all other animals, have arisen from a line of organisms whose sex organs are ultimately identical, but in which, since modifications were introduced, have resulted in differences that are now of fundamental biological importance. Hence the "femininity" of women is not the product of education or convention, but is essentially biological in character. When our knowledge of the history of life on the earth has become more extended, it will be found that it is only by tracing the processes of differentiation throughout the two entire lines of development that we may hope to unravel all the mysteries bound up in the problem of sex, or to understand the prevailing differences in character and constitution which have arisen as the outcome of this early division of labour.

TOM SALA.

(To be continued.)

THE S.L.P. AND THE S.P.G.B.

"The Weekly People"—the official organ of the Socialist Labour Party of America, in its issue for April 13th—attempts to reply to our recent references to their policy and their continual decline. (See January "Socialist Standard.")

We accused them of making Marx responsible for the statement "that only the Unions can set on foot the true political party of Labour."

They now repeat the old story that their source of information is a reformist periodical run by the German section of the New York Socialist Party. This organ, the "Volkszeitung," which the S.L.P. never tired of denouncing, is again admitted to be the only source of their knowledge of Marx's alleged statement. When and where Marx made such an utterance they have never discovered.

"The Weekly People" attempt to find support for their position in "Value, Price and Profit," but, unfortunately, they are unable to quote any extracts which tells

us that only the Trade Unions can set on foot the true political party.

On the other hand, Marx's reference to the limitations of Union activity is striking:—

"As to the limitation of the working day in England, as in all other countries, it has never been settled, except by legislative interference. Without the working men's continuous pressure from without, that interference would never have taken place. But, at all events, the result was not to be attained by private settlement between the working men and the capitalists. This very necessity of general political action affords the proof that in its merely economic action, capital is the stronger side."—"Value, Price and Profit."

We accused the S.L.P. of claiming that "Religion is a private matter."

They deny it is a public matter, and leave that as their answer. The function of religion as an instrument of capitalism in clouding the worker's mind is completely ignored by the S.L.P. So also is the fact that Socialism is based on Science.

The S.L.P. does not seem to know that the Socialist view of history is a material one, and has nothing in common with the religious concept of the universe. No wonder the S.L.P. fades. A. KOHN.

SHEFFIELD.

Will those willing to assist in forming a branch in the above area communicate with—

E. BODEN,
8, Mylnhurst Road, Ecclesall.

S.P.G.B. PROPAGANDA MEETINGS

LONDON DISTRICT.

Sunday	Clapham Common, 6.30 p.m. Tottenham, West Green Corner, 11.30 a.m. Tooting, Garrett Lane, Tooting Broadway, 7.30 p.m. Victoria Park, 4 p.m. Woolwich, Beresford Square, 7.30 p.m. Hyde Park, 11.30 a.m. Paddington, Prince of Wales, 8 p.m.
Mondays	Camberwell, Wren Road, 7.30 p.m. Clerkenwell, Garnault Place, 8 p.m.
Wednesdays	Forest Gate Station, 8 p.m.
Thursdays	Becontree, Rodney Street, Ilford, 8 p.m.
Fridays	Clerkenwell, Acton St., Grays Inn Rd., 8 p.m. Hackney, Paragon Road and Mare Street, 8 p.m.
Saturdays	Wood Green, Jolly Butchers Hill, 8 p.m. Leyton, Corner Grange Park, 7.30 p.m.
Sundays	HANLEY BRANCH. Hanley Market Square, 7 p.m. Burslem, St. John Square, 7 p.m.

BRANCH DIRECTORY.

- BATTERSEA.**—Sec., 2, Hanbury-road, S.W.11. Branch meets Thursday, 8.30 p.m. at The Waiting Room, Latchmere Baths, entrance in Burns-road. Discussion second Thurs. in month.
- BECONTREE.**—Sec., Hy. Gratton, 4, Drummond Ave., Brooklands, Romford. Branch meets 1st and 3rd Wednesdays at 7.30, at above address.
- BIRMINGHAM.**—Sec. E. Jesper, 38, Rollason-rd., Erdington. Branch meets The Continental Café, Moor St., 1st and 3rd Sundays at 11 a.m.
- CAMBERWELL.**—Branch meets at Camberwell Trades Council Room, 6A, Artichoke Place, Camberwell Green, every Friday at 8.30 p.m. Discussions—public invited. Letters to Secretary at above address.
- CENTRAL.**—Membership obtained only through the Ex. Committee. Applications to General Sec.
- CLERKENWELL.**—Branch meets Wednesdays, 8 p.m., at Emily Davison Club Rooms, 144, High Holborn (corner of Bury Street). Discussion after Branch business—all invited. Sec., at above address.
- EAST LONDON.**—Sec., D. Jacobs, 28, Lyal Road, Bow, E.3. Branch meets 1st and 3rd Mondays at 8 p.m. at Stewart's Cafe, 195, Cambridge Rd., E.2.
- GLASGOW.**—Sec. J. C. Walker, 43, Glamis Rd., E.
- HACKNEY.**—Branch meets Arcadian Cafe, 42, Amherst Road, Hackney, Mondays, 8 p.m., Discussions 9.30. Communication to Sec. as above.
- HANLEY.**—Branch meets Tuesdays, Working Men's Club, Glass-st. Sec., F. Goldstraw, 38, Paddock Street, Hanley.
- ISLINGTON.**—Branch meets Wednesdays, 8.30, at 144, Seven Sister-rd., Holloway, N. Sec., A. Gregory, 24, Gooding Rd., N.7.
- LEYTON.**—Sec., 396, Lea Bridge-rd., Leyton. Branch meets 8 p.m., Trades and Labour Hall, Grove House, High-rd., second Mondays in month.
- MANCHESTER.**—Sec., W. Addison, 111, West Park-street, Salford, Manchester.—Branch meets 1st and 3rd Thursdays in month, 7.45 p.m.
- PADDINGTON.**—Branch meeting held on 2nd and 4th Fridays, 8 p.m., in room above the Co-operative Stores, 306, Kilburn-lane, W.9 (side door).
- SOUTHEND-ON-SEA.**—Sec., J. Bird, 5 Welling-ton-avenue, Westcliffe-on-Sea.
- TOOTING.**—Sec., Miss N. Fairbrother, 36, Haverhill Road, S.W.12. Branch meets every Friday at 8 p.m. at Tooting Adult School, 971, Garratt-lane, S.W.17.
- TOTTENHAM.**—Secretary, 18, Woodlands Park Rd., N.15. Branch meets Fridays, Room 2, Trades Hall, 7, Bruce Grove. Discussion after branch business. Public invited.
- WALTHAMSTOW.**—Sec., S. E. Williams, 64, Bloxham-rd., Leyton, E.10. Branch meets at Workmen's Hall, High-st., every Monday.
- WATFORD.**—A. Lawson, Sec., 107 Kensington-avenue, Watford. Branch meets Mondays at 8.30 p.m. at Secretary's address.

- WEST HAM.**—Branch meets Thursdays at 8 p.m. at 167 Romford rd., Stratford. Sec., P. Hallard, 22, Colegrave-rd., Stratford, E.
- WOOD GREEN.**—All communications to Sec., F. W. Godfrey, 71, Falkland Road, N.8.
- WOOLWICH.**—Branch meets at 94, Griffin Road, Plumstead. Communications to Secretary at above address.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY

OF GREAT BRITAIN.

OBJECT.—The establishment of a system of society based upon the common ownership and democratic control of the means and instruments for producing and distributing wealth by and in the interests of the whole community.

DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great HOLDS— Britain

That society as at present constituted is based upon the ownership of the means of living (i.e., land, factories, railways, etc.) by the capitalist or master class, and the consequent enslavement of the working class by whose labour alone wealth is produced.

That in society, therefore, there is an antagonism of interests, manifesting itself as a class struggle, between those who possess but do not produce and those who produce but do not possess.

That this antagonism can be abolished only by the emancipation of the working class from the domination of the master class, by the conversion into the common property of society of the means of production and distribution, and their democratic control by the whole people.

That as in the order of social evolution the working class is the last class to achieve its freedom, the emancipation of the working class will involve the emancipation of all mankind, without distinction of race or sex.

That this emancipation must be the work of the working class itself.

That as the machinery of government, including the armed forces of the nation, exists only to conserve the monopoly by the capitalist class of the wealth taken from the workers, the working class must organise consciously and politically for the conquest of the powers of government, national and local, in order that this machinery, including these forces, may be converted from an instrument of oppression into the agent of emancipation and the overthrow of privilege, aristocratic and plutocratic.

That as political parties are but the expression of class interests, and as the interest of the working class is diametrically opposed to the interests of all sections of the master class, the party seeking working-class emancipation must be hostile to every other party.

The SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain, therefore, enters the field of political action determined to wage war against all other political parties, whether alleged labour or avowedly capitalist, and calls upon the members of the working class of this country to muster under its banner to the end that a speedy termination may be wrought to the system which deprives them of the fruits of their labour, and that poverty may give place to comfort, privilege to equality, and slavery to freedom.

Those agreeing with the above principles and desiring enrolment in the Party should apply for membership form to secretary of nearest branch or at Head Office.

THE Socialist Standard

The Official Organ of **THE SOCIALIST PARTY** of Great Britain.

No. 300. Vol. 25.]

LONDON, AUGUST, 1929.

[MONTHLY, TWOPENCE]

WHO PAYS FOR THE WAR?

One of the most dangerous of fallacies is the idea propagated by every political party except ourselves, that the workers have an interest in reducing the burden of taxation. This unsound theory is none the less dangerous when it is used to back up a policy which is otherwise sound.

Many people who have instinctively felt that the workers ought to oppose war, have backed up their argument by telling us that the taxation needed for the upkeep of armaments and for the replacement of destroyed property, falls on the working class!

We, on the contrary, have constantly pointed out that the position of the workers is the same, whether taxes are high or low. If taxes decline and prices follow, so do wages.

The danger of the argument used by these people was recently illustrated by Mr. Snowden's attack upon the Baldwin Government on the ground that Great Britain is paying more to America on account of war debts, and receiving less from France than ought to be the case. We ask you to recognise that it does not matter at all to the working class how the Capitalists of England, France and the U.S.A. divide up between them the proceeds of their exploitation of the working class, and the proceeds of the reparations payments taken from the German Capitalists. Those who preach otherwise are helping to stir up national hatred between the workers here and those in France and the U.S.A. The essential thing to remember is that reparations payments go to the Capitalist class, not to the workers, and taxes for armaments are a burden on the Capitalist class. If this were not so

would Capitalist Governments trouble about reducing the cost of armaments, and would the German Capitalists try to resist the payment of reparations if they could pass the burden on to the German workers?

Let us consider the facts as regards the cost of the last War. Under the Dawes Scheme, Germany paid to the Allied Government £87½ million in 1928 and will pay £125 million in 1929. (See Liberal Year Book, 1929—P. 232.) And taxation per head of the population in Germany in 1927-28 was 134 Marks as against only 31 Marks in 1913-14; that is, the taxation was more than four times as great. (See Constitutional Year Book, 1929—P. 420.)

Yet in spite of Germany having to pay huge sums in Reparations the German working class are *not* worse off than in 1914. The taxation has had to be paid by the only class which can afford to pay, that is the Capitalist class. Defeat in the War has hit the German Capitalists, not the German workers. Figures taken from German official sources disclose something of the extent of the loss of Germany's propertied class. (See "Observer," Mar. 17th.) In 1914, there were 15,549 persons with fortunes of one millions marks or over; now there are only 2,235. And owners of more than £500,000 have decreased from 229 to 33.

Now let us consider wages. The Report on Economic Conditions in Europe, published in May by the Royal Economic Society (London), shows that the purchasing power of the wages of skilled workers in Germany is about 6 per cent. or 7 per cent. *above* the 1914 level. (This

makes no allowance for increased unemployment since 1914.) And according to a German semi-official publication (*Wirtschaft und Statistik*, January, 1929) the wages of unskilled workers in Germany have risen somewhat more than this.

In Great Britain, one of the victors in the War and the receiver of part of the Reparations payments from Germany, the purchasing power of wages in 1928 was about 8 per cent. above the 1914 level, while if the increased unemployment in allowed for, the purchasing power of wages is practically the same as in 1914. (See *Labour Bulletin*, June—Published by the Labour Party. The figures are based on official and other authoritative estimates.)

RUSSIA WAS NEVER SOCIALIST.

"An Illustrated History of the Russian Revolution" (Vol. II.). Publisher: Martin Lawrence. 15s.
 "Preparing for Revolt," Lenin, 5s. (Modern Books, Ltd.). "Lessons of October," Trotsky. 3s.
 (Labour Publishing Co.).

The first volume of the "Illustrated History" was noticed in these columns in June, 1928. The second volume carries the story from July, 1917, to the introduction of the New Economic Policy.

Lenin's book consists of a series of letters and articles written between August and October, 1917; several appear in the "Illustrated History."

Trotsky's short work was published in 1925. It was written in view of the defeat of Communist strategy in Bulgaria and Germany, and suggests the necessity of "Bolshevising" the Communist International, which, being interpreted, means, "Let's have better leaders!"; a fairly familiar phrase in this country.

Trotsky claims a considerable amount of credit (as a leader of the Petrograd Military Revolutionary Committee) for the success of the insurrection of October, 1917, and eulogises Lenin ("who was not in Petrograd," p. 61), only in order to discredit Kamenev, Zinoviev and others.

He repeatedly emphasises the dependence of "the whole course of the revolution," (p. 67), upon "the broken and discontented peasant army of many millions"; yet he tells us on p. 26, "a democratic coalition of workers, peasants and soldiers could not be other than weak, and could not actually

So we see that the German workers are not worse off through Germany having to raise more taxes to pay Reparations, and British workers are not better off through Great Britain receiving Reparations. The factors which govern the workers' wages under Capitalism are not in the long run affected by the highness or lowness of taxation. The working class have no interest at stake in wars between Capitalist countries, and have no interest at stake in questions of taxation or reparations. The working class can escape from their subject position only through Socialism, not by juggling about with direct and indirect taxation, or by making "Germany" pay or by making "France" pay. H.

attain to power," hence the necessity for the Bolshevik dictatorship.

An interesting sidelight on this claim is obtained from the "Illustrated History," (p. 302). "The victory of October is attributed by the Bolshevik Party to the fact that from the very first months of the revolution they rejected not only the Mensheviks' compromises with the Capitalists, but also the idea of a 'workers' Government,' which would have isolated them from the peasants and would have left them to the mercy of the Capitalists."

Lenin chose the slogan, "All power to the Soviets!" The peasants, and not the workers, were in a majority in the Soviets (if the soldiers are reckoned among the peasants). This choice, as Lenin said, "protected" the Bolsheviks from "jumping over the peasant revolution."

Here is proof positive of the utter stupidity of the claim that the revolution in Russia was Socialist, or that the working-class hold power. According to the Bolsheviks themselves, neither separately nor in alliance with the peasants is such a thing conceivable. The much-vaunted dictatorship of the proletariat is nothing more than a hollow euphemism for opportunist office-holding by the Bolshevik Party.

Let us turn to Lenin. There is a consider-

able amount of repetition in his book which might well be boiled down to the two articles entitled "The Approaching Crisis" and "Will the Bolsheviks maintain power?"

In the former he deals with his proposed economic measures.

Here are the chief of these measures:—

- (1) The nationalisation of the banks.
- (2) The nationalisation of the trusts (sugar, petroleum, coal and metal monopolies).
- (3) The suppression of business secrecy.
- (4) The obligation for all industrialists, merchants and employers to group themselves into trusts.
- (5) Enforcement of the organisation of the population in consumers, societies under the control of the State.

Speaking of the first proposal, he says, "The ownership of the capital with which the banks operate is certified by printed slips called shares, bonds, etc. Not one of these slips is suppressed or altered by the nationalisation of the banks . . . whosoever has fifteen millions, keeps his fifteen millions." (pp. 107-109).

"Nationalisation would have immense advantages, not so much for the workers (who rarely do business at a bank) as for the mass of peasants and small industrialists" (p. 111).

"From the military point of view it would bring immense advantages, and would increase the military strength of Russia" (p. 112).

Speaking of trust nationalisation, "It is necessary to appeal directly to the initiative of the workers and offer them a definite percentage of profits on condition that they exercise complete control and increase production" (p. 119). And again, "What we have to do, I repeat, is not establish Socialism in a day, but *expose the theft of public money*," p. 124 (italics Lenin's).

"The vital matter is not the confiscation of Capitalist property, but universal, all-embracing workers' control over the Capitalists and their possible supporters" (p. 192).

How did these proposals work out in practice? In the industrial establishments, as on the land, the closing days of the Provisional Government in 1917, witnessed the growth of anarchy, economic disorder.

"The workers, even before October and during October, began to occupy the fac-

ories unsystematically" (p. 533, "Illustrated History"), therefore,

"The Soviet Power saw itself faced with difficult problems of organisation Not merely was there no idea of the immediate introduction of Socialism, but it was also not held necessary to nationalise the whole of industry."

The Soviet Power adopted the plan of the introduction of a special form of State Capitalism in which the majority of the factories and workshops still remain the private property of the Capitalists, are not yet nationalised.

These factories are joined together in trusts under the control of the proletarian State (from above) and the organs of workers control (from below). This was a programme for the collaboration of the proletarian State and the Capitalists, for the leading and reconstruction of industry" (p. 526-7).

The years of intervention and civil war, 1918-21, forced the Soviet Power to go much further in the direction of the regulation of private property relations than it had intended" (p. 527).

Yet even so we learn on p. 549 that "up to the year 1921 it is not possible to speak of a Socialist system of production." As for the so-called "workers' control," that went the way of the Constituent Assembly and several other items promised by the insurrectionists, and even "decreed" — on paper.

"During the second half of 1918, the nationalisation *en masse* of factories began in the towns . . . The direct leadership of industries by State organs took the place of control of production by the workers."

During the period of "war Communism," "Famine and confusion tortured the working population to the limits of endurance" (p. 527). Between July, 1918, and the beginning of 1920, something like half-a-million workers (a third of those engaged in large-scale industry) went to work on the land largely owing to the fall in real wages (p. 550).

There "the October revolution had not merely deprived the landlords of their land and given it to the peasants it had also intensified the internal conflicts among the various classes of peasantry" (p. 551).

No sooner had "March, 1920, brought final victory to the Red Flag" (p. 543) however, than the peasant ranks closed in oppo-

sition to the very "State which had led the struggle against the rebels who were fighting to regain the property of the landlords" (p. 553).

"War Communism had forbidden trade, but a new form of secret trading arose. Conditions in these secret trade markets were uncommonly favourable for the peasants" (p. 553).

In the early part of 1921 strikes broke out for increased rations and the restoration of trade.

"Discussion disclosed the antagonism within the ruling party, revived the united forces of the other parties, and weakened the influence of the party over the workers at the most critical moment" (p. 554).

Then occurred the Kronstadt rebellion. "Its economic demands were completely met by the N.E.P.," which Lenin definitely described as a retreat. (Speech at the Plenum of Moscow Soviet, November 19th, 1922.) Writing in September, 1917, Lenin had declared that "Russia is a country dominated by the petty bourgeoisie. The vast majority of the population belong to this class" ("Preparing for Revolt," p. 67).

Five years later conditions bore eloquent testimony to the facts that "it is impossible to introduce machinery on a large scale into agriculture in Russia," and that "no insurrection will create Socialism if the economic conditions do not permit of the establishment of it" ("Preparing for Revolt," pp. 152-3).

With the substitution of taxation of the peasantry for compulsory grain deliveries, agricultural production and trade resumed their normal course. The State industries expanded and the number of workers engaged in large-scale industry generally increased by over a million in five years ("Illustrated History," p. 560).

This very great increase, etc., was still, however, insufficient to absorb all the unemployed streaming in from the land. The number of registered unemployed rose to 1,310,000 on December 31st, 1926 (p. 561).

Thus a third of the workers are on the dole.

The reason is not far to seek. "Agriculture is not only employing a much larger amount of machinery than before the war, but, as time goes on, more complicated machinery also, as, for example, tractors. In 1914, the total number of tractors in

Russia was 187, while in the U.S.S.R. in 1926 there were 23,000 tractors in use" (p. 562).

Yet even this development leaves Russia fundamentally peasant. It is not one, nor two, but several tens of millions who require industrialising on modern lines before they are likely to be fit material for Socialism.

It is owing to "the low stage of development of Russia's productive forces and the incompleteness of her economic and technical organisation" that the colossal strain of the World War precipitated Tsarism and the last relics of feudalism into the abyss. The State machine had to be reorganised, not in order to abolish an imperfectly developed Capitalism, but in order to clear the way for its development. As in the French Revolution, so in Russia, the interests of *individuals* who had amassed great wealth in any form under the old regime had to be sacrificed to the interests of the property-owning class generally.

This is all the so-called "Socialism" of Russia amounts to. The chief victims were the landed aristocrats, who were the most active section of the counter revolutionaries.

Split up into half-a-dozen political groups, the rest of the property-owning class were unable to come to a permanently workable agreement.

With an army in revolt and economic collapse in sight, power passed into the hands of the only party with sufficient organisation and understanding to face the task of peace and reconstruction. That this party contained a considerable working-class element and possessed also a marked degree of Socialist knowledge, is an encouraging symptom of working-class ability and the spread of revolutionary ideas.

All this, however, does not blind us to the fact that the Bolshevik power rests on the control of a conscript peasant army and that political expression of the class antagonisms (which are denied legal form *outside* the Party) find vent *within* the Party. The Bolsheviks silenced the Social Revolutionary Party, but carried out their agrarian programme.

In like manner a "Labour" Government in this country administers Liberal reforms.

The foreign policy of the Bolsheviks which was announced with such a flourish has likewise proved but a variant of the old Tsarist policy of intrigue. Instead of assisting in the education of the international working-class it has financed confusion and

the propaganda of criminally futile policies of insurrection, long ago obsolete in Western Europe.

The working-class in this and other countries must capture power, but this will not be accomplished by the influence of magic slogans. When the workers are ready to establish the co-operative commonwealth, they must at least be ready to vote for it.

E. B.

A PARLIAMENTARY JOKE.

Captain D. W. Gunston is Tory M.P. for Thornbury and also a humorist. It is the aim of those who combine these two features to try to trap unsuspecting ministers with questions which are only seemingly innocent. It will be remembered that immediately after the General Election Sir W. Jowitt, K.C., M.P. for Preston, who had been elected as a Liberal, accepted the office of Attorney-General and joined the Labour Party. Below is Captain Gunston's question and Mr. Clynes' reply (Hansard, July 11, '29):—

Captain Gunston asked the Home Secretary if he will consider the introduction of legislation to prohibit the practice of the payment of sums of money on the transfer of professional football players from one club to another?


Mr. Clynes: The answer is in the negative.

Captain Gunston: While appreciating that the Government do not want to interfere with the transfer of talent, may I ask the right hon. gentleman if he is in a position to inform the House of the transfer fee, if any, in the case of the Attorney-General?

CURRENCY REFORM AND SOCIALISM.

E. WRIGHT (Denmark Park), tells us that we ought not to ignore money reform because, we would be able, by means of it, to "do wonders in starting State-owned industries." Our correspondent omits, however, to explain what advantage to the working class State-ownership is, or what it has to do with Socialism. Our aim is Socialism not State capitalism.

ED. COMM.

 Send your **TINFOIL** to the General Secretary at the Head Office—It will help to Raise Funds.

OLD AGE PENSIONS IN U.S.A. AN INTERESTING LETTER FROM AN AMERICAN READER.

Comrades,

In recent years it has become a quite common occurrence for the various Capitalist newspapers in England and elsewhere to point to the U.S.A. as an example of unparalleled prosperity. A land in which the workers are enjoying a "Golden Age of Labour." Where automobiles are owned by each and every worker who cares to own one. (Until he omits to pay the next instalment.) And where, in short, the problems that afflict the workers and the rest of the Capitalist world do not exist.

Those of us who are compelled to sell our labour power in the U.S.A., and who are interested in working-class conditions, can only smile and wish that the conditions of the working-class as set forth in the foreign press were real, instead of existing as the "suppressed desires" of so many journalists with whom the wish is "father to the thought."

This kind of Capitalist propaganda is not limited to envious foreigners, for here in the U.S.A. the gospel of prosperity is preached far and wide.

The question of importance is: Do the American workers enjoy prosperity? In order to answer this question, I will quote from an article appearing in the "New York World" (Sunday, June 2nd, 1929). The article deals with the growing need for old-age pensions in the U.S.A. The author is Mr. Herbert H. Lehman, Lieut.-Governor of the State of New York. He is a leading member of the Democratic Party, and we are informed by his interviewer that Mr. Lehman has close contacts with industry and banking.

To begin with, the gentleman informs us that:—

The prosperity of every country depends on the well-being of its workers. Although the United States is enjoying a period of great prosperity there are two major labour problems, already the cause of wide discontent, that will become more acute as production speed increases: the dearth of employment for able-bodied men between 45 and 65, who cannot meet the speed demands of industry; and the condition of the dependent aged who have nothing to look forward to but the poorhouse.

As further proof that this is not a future tendency, but an existing fact, our writer continues with:—

As production speed increases and labour-saving devices multiply, fewer and fewer jobs will sur-

vive that do not require the speed of youth. In addition to the decreasing value of the middle-aged man in speed work, the spread of group insurance increases the discrimination against him because he is a more expensive risk than the young man. The age employment limit, now set between 45 and 50 by many industries, seems likely to be pushed even lower. In the meantime medical science is steadily increasing the span of life. Between the machine that takes his job and the achievements of science that make him live longer, the worker is caught between two millstones.

The writer is not in favour of the poorhouse, partly because he dislikes the stigma of charity, but mainly because he is one of the few members of the Capitalist class who realises the costliness of building and supporting poorhouses. In fact we are told that:—

I am convinced that even if the poorhouse system of New York State could be enlarged adequately to meet the needs of our aged dependents, the cost would be considerably larger than that of an assistance system which would allow the old people to live in their own homes.

As an alternative to poorhouses he suggests pensions for the aged.

This suggestion so far does not meet with the approval of the rest of the Capitalist class. Their arguments in opposing this measure range from its being "Socialistic" to the danger of its being responsible for the "loss of incentive" on the part of the workers when given such aid. But our writer is not at a loss for answers to all of these criticisms. To the first criticism his reply is:—

Some of the opponents of old age pensions have been shouting about "Socialistic policies." The pensioning of the aged is no more Socialistic than the care of the sick and the insane.

Thus the demands of the English Labour Party find favour in the ranks of the American Capitalist Class. And as for the menace to working-class incentive we are informed by the writer that:—

Certain critics of old age assistance, argue that such a policy would withdraw all incentive to save and would tend to pauperise the labouring classes. This contention scarcely carries conviction when we remember that the maximum pension thus far considered is \$1 a day in case the worker had no other income. This would be sufficient to supply only the barest necessities of life. No one would deliberately choose such a state of poverty.

No! No one would. The amount of choice the American worker has in staying off the inevitable of poverty and destitution can easily be imagined when we are informed by the same gentleman that:—

I cannot see how the average worker can be expected to support his family and save enough

money to take care of unemployed old age, regardless of apparently high current wages. The margin of earnings over the minimum cost of respectable living is too small.

Just what he means by "respectable living" he does not inform us. Although our author is a business man, he is not altogether "hard-boiled." In fact, it is because he is a business man and knows something regarding the workings of the Capitalist system that he lets slip his journalistic crocodile's tear.

All of us know personally cases of industrious small shop owners who raised large families and were useful citizens; but when they became too old to work found themselves without resources and faced what seemed to them the disgrace of ending their days in the poorhouse.

And between sniffs of sympathy we are left to wonder if their usefulness is to be found in their raising "large families." The worst is yet to come, for—

Shoemakers, butchers, grocery storekeepers and bakers—they eke out a living but not enough to insure the future. In the next decade their plight will be worse than ever because many of them are exhausting the savings of a lifetime in a vain fight against the encroachments of chain stores.

So this is an example "of prosperity in America."

The obvious and only conclusion one can draw is that the workers of the U.S.A., like the workers the whole world over, are faced with the self-same problems; the problems of poverty and destitution. These problems have a solution, and the solution lies in the abolition of the present social system that produces such conditions, and in its place the establishment of a system of society wherein the wealth of society shall be enjoyed by all in common.

I am,

Yours fraternally,
SIDNEY FELPERIN.

ANSWERS TO CORRESPONDENTS.

A letter from a correspondent containing a series of questions on wages, the money system, etc., has been lost. Will the correspondent please write again.

* * *

RECEIVED FOR REVIEW.

"The Soviet Union & Peace." Published by Martin Lawrence, 26, Bedford Row. Price 7/6.

"Karl Marx," by Otto Ruhle. Published by Allen & Unwin. Translated by Eden & Cedar Paul. Price 15/-.

YOUR Newsagent can obtain this journal from
Wholesale Agents: W. H. Smith & Son, Strand
House, W.C.

ASPECTS OF THE "WOMAN QUESTION."

(Based on Notes of a Series of Lectures on "The Sexes in Evolution.")

(Continued.)

The status of woman in primitive society is examined. There are divergent opinions among the anthropologists themselves regarding this feature of social development. Some assert that a matriarchal stage lasting a long time was passed through by most primitive civilisations—a stage in which women were dominant. Others believe that if such a state did exist it was probably of short duration. They claim that though evidence unearthed in Egypt, Mesopotamia and elsewhere indicates that a high degree of civilisation existed as far back as 20,000 years ago, there is very little to show that women occupied a truly dominant position.

The only way to arrive at an answer to these questions is to study the lower cultures that can be observed to-day, or have been observed and recorded within "historical" times. Where there is history there is, of course, continuity from prehistory, and it is the task of the anthropologist to trace this continuity as far back as possible.

Briffault, in his monumental work, "The Mothers," concludes that women occupied a relatively high position. In his opinion, the primal human group is not the family (in the modern sense), but a larger group which he calls "motherhood." The assertion, he says, that "the family is the foundation of society" is belied by all the facts, anthropological and biological. He bases his claim for a belief in the relatively high position of woman on the fact that they could not have forced themselves up from an original subjection to the position they are assumed to have occupied. To some extent he appears to have followed Bachofen, though Bachofen could hardly have been conversant with the theory of the development of the human species from pre-existing orders. Support is lent to Briffault's contention of the existence of a matriarchal group by researches which have revealed that early economic relations were based on productiveness, and not on property, and that women were the chief producers. Out of woman's early activities, based on the maternal instinct which conserves the highest interests of her offspring,

was established the principle which afterwards governed human groups—the principle of cohesion and sympathy—a factor which made organisation possible and progress attainable.

At one period she was elevated to the ideal of the mother goddess. As a divinity she was set apart what time the male was busy reacting to the herd instinct, and incidentally diverting the line of social development. At another period she is degraded to the position of a chattel, actually below that of cattle as regards her value. In early Greece women sank so low that they were treated as mere agencies of reproduction. In Biblical times both Moses and St. Paul were hostile to women, and the same hatred was displayed by both Tertullian and Origen, early Fathers of the Christian Church.

We then pass on to a consideration of her position within historical times, where the evidence is more reliable and easier to interpret. Under Feudalism the position of women improved somewhat, and in the Renaissance we find their lot still better, comparatively. But with the growth of wealth in the later Middle Ages their position changed from that of the cult of the saint to that of a mere colourless female character compelled to servitude. With the advent of the Industrial Revolution changed conditions forced them from this servitude to that of another kind—production in the home, with child labour as one of its deadly features, until, with the rise of modern capitalism, we arrive at conditions as we find them to-day.

TOM SALA.

(To be continued.)

CLASSES AT HEAD OFFICE.

Arrangements are being made to organise education and discussion classes at Head Office in the autumn. Further particulars will be published in due course.

TO OUR READERS. PLEASE NOTE.

The "Socialist Standard" can be obtained from the following Newsagents—

Coombs & Fancourt, 541, Barking Road, Plaistow.
A. E. Cohen, 297, Barking Road, East Ham.
H. Williams, 36, Barking Road, Canning Town.
C. W. Honess, 63, Stratford Road, Plaistow.
H. S. Bailey, 42, Tower Bridge Road, S.E.
A. Dennington, 518, Romford Road, Manor Park.
Brewster, 155, Barking Road.
W. Villiers, 139, Lower Road, Rotherhithe, S.E.

OFFICIAL NOTICE.

All communications for the Executive Committee, Subscriptions for the SOCIALIST STANDARD, Articles, and Correspondence submitted for insertion therein, should be addressed—The Socialist Party of Great Britain, 42, Great Dover Street, London, S.E.1, to whom Money Orders should be made payable.

The meetings of the Executive Committee are held at the Head Office, every Tuesday, at 7.30 p.m.

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTIONS.

Twelve Months, post free... .. 2s. 6d.
Six Months, post free 1s. 3d.

The Socialist Standard,

AUG.,



1929

THE LABOUR GOVERNMENT. TRUTH WILL OUT!

The Socialist Party of Great Britain was formed 25 years ago to work for Socialism. We found ourselves then, as now, opposed by the I.L.P. and other bodies, whose members believed that it was useless to preach Socialism. Their method was to try to win working-class support by promising and agitating for Old Age Pensions, Health Insurance and other reforms. The workers, they said, want not Socialism, but "something now." Let us promise them what they want and thus get a Labour Government. The numerous benefits it will bestow on the workers will then win their support for the introduction of Socialism.

This theory, as we pointed out, was based on a series of misconceptions. It assumed that a Labour Government could so run Capitalism as to remove the great problems which have been, and are being, produced by Capitalism. It assumed, in other words, that unemployment, poverty and the like, are the outcome, not of the system, but of the stupidity, malevolence or incompetence, of Liberal and Tory statesmen. It overlooked the very important lesson of modern representative Government that the party which happens to be in power gets blamed by

working-class electors for the evil effects of the Capitalist system on themselves.

All these years we have carried on the hard struggle to build up a party of Socialists, understanding and ready to work for Socialism. Our critics, in the meantime, have carried on their work of building up the non-Socialist Labour Party, incidentally making our work tenfold more difficult. They have succeeded to the point of being in power, the largest party in the House. But no sooner do they get to work than they discover the truth of some of the counts in our argument.

Mr. J. H. Thomas, Lord Privy Seal, is commander-in-chief of the special section devoting its energies to the problem of unemployment. On Friday, July 5th, he addressed at Southampton the Annual General Meeting of the National Union of Railwaymen. He first admitted that the Labour Government is in office to administer the Capitalist system. He said:—

I have been entrusted with the responsibility of seeing how far within the limits of our Parliamentary traditions and our resources of the State—and accepting the present order of society—how far it is possible to mobilise, organise, institute, and get going useful works for those now unemployed. (See "Daily Herald" Report, 6 July.—Italics ours.)

His subsequent remarks indicated that even a few weeks of office have taught him how little difference a change of persons makes to the administration of Capitalism. He said:—

We ask you not to expect too much, nor attempt to force from us, because we are a Labour Government, what you would not force from a Capitalist Government.

Thus we have the delightful spectacle of the workers being asked not to demand their instalment of "something now" (which they have already waited a generation to get) by the very people who have preached the doctrine of "something now" in opposition to Socialism.

The moral of this has been seen by at least one Labour opponent of the Socialist Party, Mr. Tom Kirk, alderman at West Ham. In a letter to the "New Statesman" (July 13th) he states that the Labour Government's declarations on unemployment caused dismay among their supporters in the House. But what is most significant is Mr. Kirk's admission that the building up of the Labour Party has been at the expense of Socialist propaganda. He writes:—

The work, however, of building a Labour Party thrust "critical revolutionary" Socialism

into the background, where it stubbornly maintained itself in the Socialist Party of Great Britain.

Mr. Kirk, one of those who helped to thrust Socialism "into the background," is now convinced that the Labour Government will prove a broken reed. "Indeed," he writes, "unless I read things wrongly, we shall soon witness a reversion to the earlier standpoints of the old S.D.F."

To this we need only add that the earlier standpoints of the S.D.F. are embodied in the Socialist Party of Great Britain, the only organisation which declined to abandon Socialism in order to build up the Labour Party, and the only organisation which will not be implicated in the disgust and disillusion which will follow the inevitable failure of Labour Government.

MR. WHEATLEY'S LAPSE. STRANGE STORY OF A LITTLE CHILD.

During 1924 Mr. Wheatley, M.P., was Minister of Health in the Labour Cabinet, described by the "New Leader" as being "to an overwhelming extent an I.L.P. Government" (see "New Leader" of February 8, '24). In the present Labour Government Mr. Wheatley has been supplanted by the Right Hon. Arthur Greenwood, M.P.

Speaking in the House on July 15, Mr. Wheatley found occasion to criticise his successor and, in passing, to pat himself on the back for his Housing Act of 1924. He said:—

The one piece of Socialistic legislation that has been placed on the Statute Book is the Act of 1924. Members opposite have said that, as far as they can manage it, it will be a long time before there is an increase in the family. We must, therefore, go on with this one little Socialist child while they control the House of Commons. (Hansard, 15 July, 1929.)

Those who know of Mr. Wheatley's political associations and activities, or have seen his Act, will hardly need to be told that the description of the child is grossly inaccurate.

Young Wheatley's capitalist parentage stands out in every feature, and the birth certificate bearing the father's signature and dated June, 1924, certifies to this effect. It is, moreover, worded quite emphatically, because the father had had to repudiate certain malicious assertions on the point made by a man called Jix.

Speaking in the House on June 3, '24 (see Hansard of that date) Mr. Wheatley said:—

I notice that the right hon. Member for Twickenham, in criticising my proposals the other day, said, "This is real Socialism!" I can compliment my right hon. Friend on many things, but I cannot say that he is good judge of Socialism. . . . The proposals which I am submitting are real capitalism—an attempt to patch up, in the interests of humanity, a capitalist ordered society.

"Why, then," the reader may well ask, "does Mr. Wheatley so malign his own five-year-old son?" The truth is, perhaps, that the father, like his friend Jix, is not a good judge of Socialism and cannot be held fully responsible. Certainly, the real fault lies with the mother, a Labour person, calling herself I.L.P., who has time and time again been found misrepresenting herself as a Socialist party. This leads many uninformed persons to believe that the progeny of the Labour Party which the I.L.P. perambulates about are Socialist children, whereas in fact they are only the same little brats as before, dressed up in new clothes. I.L.P. is, however, fairly smart, and it is not often that she allows herself to be caught in the very act of kidnapping capitalist children like this and attempting to pass them off merely by dressing them up differently. She and her 200 members in Parliament are engaged in the business of administering capitalism. Mr. Wheatley, while still standing in some rather uneasy relationship with the Labour firm, has lost his previous lucrative position as producer of capitalist Housing Acts, and in his desire for revenge tries to embarrass his former employers and their new Minister of Health by disseminating these untrue stories about his own favourite son. It can therefore be stated quite definitely that this child of Wheatley and the I.L.P. was born and remains a capitalist child. It has not in the meantime suffered a strange transformation as his callous parent pretends.

All of which goes to show the value of birth certificates when parents are so forgetful or dishonest.

H.

GET TOGETHER!

Readers of the "Socialist Standard" who desire to be put into communication with other readers in their district are invited to notify the General Secretary, at 17 Mount Pleasant, W.C.1.

A LOOK ROUND.

THE ARMY OF TO-DAY.

When we point out to so-called Communists and others that as a prelude to emancipation a Socialist working class must control the political machine in order to give them control of the armed forces of the State, we anticipate certain stereotyped objections. These we have met again and again in these columns. So far, no evidence has been produced to show that our policy understood by a majority of workers would not enable them to deal with any eventuality that might arise in the future. One of the stock objections raised is that the Army and Navy is officered by members of the capitalist class, and will therefore refuse to take instructions and orders from a Socialist-controlled Parliament. Apart from the fact that those who get control also get control of the finances upon which the whole Army must depend, the bulk of the Army and Navy officers are to-day not members of the capitalist class. By the time also that a considerable Socialist opinion has developed among the working class, it is reasonable to assume that soldiers drawn as they are from working-class homes will be more or less permeated with Socialist opinions. The Capitalists of to-day are a numerically small class, and are compelled to have their Army, Navy and Air Force officers trained in the same way that they have to train their managers, organisers and specialists. Just as the latter have grown more numerous than their masters' requirements, so is the Army officer landed in a similar plight. When, for various reasons the master class no longer require the services of their "gentleman" officers, they become the most helpless section of the numbers who go to swell the growing army of the unemployed. Let the Communists note well the following:—

At Clements Inn alone over 2,000 ex-Officers are registered as unemployed, and these are only a part of those who, apart from work, need food and clothing. Ex-Officers there are with University honours, who are compelled to perform menial tasks in lodging houses in order to earn money for food. In a similar plight are men from all the leading Universities, men from Eton, men from Sandhurst, members of the Institute of Civil Engineers. (Letter to the "Daily Telegraph," 9/7/29, from W. E. Southgate, Capt., ex-Officer Unemployment Committee.)

OUR RICH FRIENDS.

Socialism does not mean confiscation. Labour protests against the misleading suggestions of its opponents that it attacks private property and preaches class war. (Mr. Arthur Henderson, at Blackburn, "Daily Chronicle," 27/5/29.)

We have always claimed, and proved, that Socialism necessarily involves the conversion of capitalist private property into the commonly owned property or means of life of the whole of society. Such a revolution we also claim would remove the antagonism in society which arises out of the capitalist ownership of the workers' means of living and their consequent enslavement. That antagonism of interest is the class struggle, eventually manifesting itself as a struggle for emancipation. Mr. Bernard Baron, a wealthy capitalist, apparently understands this, and sees that only Socialists will ever struggle for emancipation. He knows that the Labour Party cannot be a Socialist Party without Socialist supporters, and that in their own words they are a "bulwark against revolution." Other capitalists who support or join the Labour Party know likewise, and that the political ignorance which such a party reflects will also preserve the system which enables them to filch nine-tenths of Labour's product. Need we be surprised, then, when we read that "Mr. Bernard Baron forwarded to Mr. Arthur Henderson a cheque for £5,000 for the Socialist (!) Party funds? Mr. Baron contributed a similar amount at the General Election of 1924" ("Daily Herald," 10.5.29.). We also are entitled to protest against the "misleading suggestion" that the Labour Party is, or ever was, a Socialist Party.

EITHER OR EITHER.

Sir Herbert Samuel is one of those brainy Liberal gentlemen who, like the rest of his lawyer-like tribe, can prove black is white as occasion arises. People who don't handle the truth carefully, should, as the maxim reminds us, cultivate retentive memories, otherwise "bright young people" may discover that these gentlemen are nothing but political charlatans. After the following we need not wonder either, how it is that Liberal lawyers like

Sir W. Jowitt can go to bed Liberal and wake up "Labour." No wonder Ramsay wrote "I have often wondered what there was of any substance which really divided us." ("Times," June 8, '29.) Says Sir Herbert number one: "In the Labour Party's manifesto Socialism was relegated to the background. For the most part it was a *Liberal* programme which Mr. MacDonald and his colleagues advocated" ("Times," May 2, '29). Says Sir Herbert number two: "The Labour Party declares itself to be definitely Socialist. The speeches of its leading members, the resolutions passed by its conferences, have made this clear beyond the possibility of doubt." (Article in "Answers," May 25, '29.) Without doubt Sir Herbert Samuel would also find no more difficulty in turning a political somersault than Sir W. Jowitt.

THE RIGHT TO BE LAZY.

According to the "Daily Chronicle," (10.7.29), there are 1,142,400 out of work, an increase of 24,593 on the previous week. The total on July 1 comprised 889,000 men, 28,300 boys, 199,500 women and 25,500 girls. In the same paper, same date, same column, we also read under the sub-heading of "Society Acrobats" that: "The diverse activities of well-known people have been keeping the photographers exceptionally busy, according to this week's issue of that bright review 'The Sketch.' Half the social world appears to have skipped over to Le Touquet for the golf tournament of Buck's Club, while the other half was either at the Peterborough Foxhound Show or the extraordinary circus held in a West-End mansion. Polo and a water party at Roehampton claimed many notable people, some of whom are seen doing complicated 'physical jerks' on Major Paget's lawn to time set by gramophone" (Ibid).

We are not kill-joys, nor are we much concerned with these antics about which the tripe journalists write so much trash. What we do object to is the humdrum existence we, like the rest of the workers, have to submit to because they do not understand the ease and comfort possible for all if the present means of wealth production were commonly owned and utilized for that purpose. If the pleasures of these idlers appear somewhat inane and trumpery, it is mainly because they are only the pleasures of a pampered few which in the present

system is based upon the slavish and joyless existence of the many. An intelligent race of men and women would require more elevating enjoyment than baby parties, freak dinners or society circuses. When the working class begin to realise that the ushering in of a system free from stupid social absurdities and contradictions depends entirely on their own efforts, the end of this capitalist pandemonium will be well in sight.

CATHOLIC TRUTH.

In these days when everything in the political world is dubbed Socialism, those desirous of obtaining knowledge should ever be critical even of those claiming to be Socialists. One would hardly expect the late Prime Minister to air Socialist views, yet in a leading article in the "Daily Mail" (June 10, '29) we are seriously informed that:—

Mr. Baldwin has contributed as much to the growth of Socialism as Mr. Ramsay MacDonald, for he is a Semi-Socialist. His speeches and his pronouncements have frequently been indistinguishable from those of avowed Socialists.

Of course, this is only eye-wash for the working class. Our masters and their agents know that the Socialism that they dread is that which is in line with the teaching of Karl Marx, a Socialism founded on Science. It is because of our masters' need to know the real enemy, and not the bogey used to frighten the workers, that we sometimes get the truth in strange places as follows:—

It is of little purpose to point out that the Socialist condemned (by the Pope) is Marxism, and not Fabianism or its analogues in various countries. (Catholic Encyclopædia, Vol. 14, p. 67.)

SOMETHING NOW.

The futility of the policy of waiting for "Somebody to do something" is illustrated in the following. In the House of Commons it appears there is a catering department the staff of which receives the following enormous wages: Waiters, 31/6 (with food), barmaids (after 10 years' service), 29/-; cash desk attendants, 24/-; kitchen hands, 20/- per week. Remembering that we have in office a Labour Party for whom eight million people voted, it is instructive to note that, in answer to a question in Parliament, a Mr. Compton, Labour member and Chairman of the

Kitchen Committee, stated that: "An immediate revision of wages could not be entertained" ("Daily Chronicle," 18.7.29.). After all it might set a bad example to cotton operatives, railwaymen, and others to concede wages to these people on a level with the cost of the keep of paupers and convicts (sic). Perhaps we shall be told that the Labour Party is not yet in power.

PILLS FOR EARTHQUAKES.

The workman who owns his own house and has saved enough to assure himself at least of bread and butter for his family is one of the rocks against which the doctrines of revolution will always foam in vain. ("Evening News," 13/7/29.)

Although apparently this thrifty individual becomes a householder, he still remains a workman. Only a very small percentage of the millions of the workers own their own houses. If house ownership could form rocks against revolution, we wonder why our masters don't rush to pay wages that might enable the majority to buy a shelter. Let us suppose, only suppose, mind you, that they did. Would not the wicked revolutionary creep in with his insidious economics and point out that, with an all-round removal of the cursed rent item, a lowered cost of living would mean lowered wages? He would! True, numbers have to save, scrape, and mortgage in order to buy a house; they could not get one in any other way to-day, but it requires more than a house or a Post Office Savings account to secure the worker against the insecurity of modern times. None but a fortunate few manage to save even sufficient to provide for an emergency or old age, and irony of ironies, millions who have toiled their lives through piling up wealth for others pay a few coppers insurance per week to save them from the stigma of a pauper's grave.

MAC.

NOW ON SALE.

MANIFESTO THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN.

Sixth Edition—With New Preface.

Price 2d.

Post Free, 2½d.

An Armoury of facts exposing the Labour Party,
I.L.P. and similar "Labour Organisations."

THE NEW TRANSLATION OF CAPITAL.

A LETTER FROM THE TRANSLATOR.

To the Editor of the SOCIALIST STANDARD.
Dear Comrade,

We want to thank Comrade Fitzgerald for a very useful list of misprints (see the opening article in your March issue). He complains of our translating *geistig* as "spiritual," when Moore and Aveling's translation (revised by Engels) has "intellectual." There is a German word, *intellektuell*, and we think if Marx had meant what the English mean by "intellectual," he would have used that word. He was referring to wants which belong to the sphere of feeling as well as to that of the intellect, and, therefore, used the more comprehensive term, *geistig*. But this word is often difficult to translate, and we agree that possibly "spiritual" may convey an un-Marxian impression, so in the reprint now being called for we are changing the word to "mental." The misprints mentioned, and some others, are likewise being corrected.

As to the question whether the new translation is an improvement on the old, it is not for the translators to offer an opinion of their own. They were commissioned to make a new translation by publishers who thought that the old translation did not do justice to the book. They were instructed to use the fourth German edition as their text, the last one revised by Engels; and certainly no disrespect to Engels' memory was intended or implied by holding that he could not be considered a final arbiter upon questions of English terminology and style.

As to what reviewers think of the new translation, Comrade Fitzgerald is in good company in doubting whether it is an improvement. The "Times" holds the same view, and is surprised that a new translation has been made. Comrade Ryazanoff, the learned chief of the Marx-Engels' Institute in Moscow, takes the translators severely to task in a letter to the "Labour Monthly." But with these notable exceptions, the new translation has been greeted with an almost universal chorus of approval. We quote a few voices at random:—

"A new translation . . . the work of such experienced translators . . . is to be

welcomed. . . . Mr. and Mrs. Paul have done their work extremely well."—"Nation and Athenæum."

"The work is exceedingly well done, and those who may have previously found Marx unreadable will do well to try again with this competent and well-written translation in their hands."—"Friend."

"This new translation . . . is much superior to the only other one this reviewer knows. . . . It can be read without risk of mental collapse."—"Bulletin" (Sydney, N.S.W.).

"Anyone who has ever wrestled with Marx knows how terribly bad and unreadable the old translation of *Das Kapital* was. In the skilful hands of Dr. and Mrs. Paul, Marx reads like a different man. . . . Something of the real quality of his own style appears in the translation."—"New Statesman."

"The Moore and Aveling edition is 'so inelegantly rendered that,' etc., . . . 'The present rendering is so superlatively good that,' etc., . . . 'The present smooth and delightful translation will introduce

Marx to a wider circle of English readers than he has ever had in the past."—"Cherwell."

"Those well-known translators, Eden and Cedar Paul, have added to their long list of personal triumphs a work for which posterity will have good cause to thank them."—"Yorkshire Observer."

"This excellent translation . . . will be doubly welcome . . . more readable than any previously published in this country."—"Bookman."

And so on; and so on; and so on.

"Bourgeois opinion," we seem to hear the critics murmur—Comrades Fitzgerald and Ryazanoff, anyhow, though probably not the "Thunderer" of Printing House Square.

Yes, bourgeois opinion. But it is not a case of a Labour leader being praised for kow-towing to the Prince of Wales, and there are times when the old adage holds good, *fas est ab hoste doceri*—it is expedient to learn even from an enemy.

Yours fraternally,

EDEN AND CEDAR PAUL.

CAPITALISM AND WAR.

When man's control over nature was considerably less than at present, there was always the fear of thousands being laid low by famine and disease. The productive capacity and means of transport existing to-day have obviated the danger of famine; shortage in one part of the world being counterbalanced by abundance in other parts. And hygienic and medical knowledge enables man to check contagious disease in its early stages.

There remains, however, a fear which oppresses millions of people at the present time; the fear of war. The mechanical and chemical means of slaughter in existence to-day are so vast and terrifying that scarcely anyone can view the prospect of war between powerful nations without feelings of horror. In short it is not the natural elements that inspire the greatest fear, but man-made instruments of destruction.

The horror engendered by the contemplation of this danger gives rise to organisations with the abolition of war as their object.

So much has been written of late on the

subject of peace and disarmament, and so much of it by people whose business it is, not to lay bare the actual causes of war, but rather to hide them; and so much of it by well-meaning people who do not understand the causes, that it may be useful for the benefit of new readers to clarify the matter.

The first wars were fought between nomadic peoples in search of the means of subsistence, and as there did not exist any class division within the communities, the war was fought in the interest of the whole group, the spoils being enjoyed by all. With the rise of classes—which could not take place until it was possible for the producers to produce a surplus above their own needs—and the division of society into ruling and subject classes, wars were then waged in the interests of the rulers, and from that time onward have always been in the interests of the particular ruling class.

It is necessary to note that from the beginning wars had an economic cause, for it is the purpose of this article to show that all wars are at bottom the outcome of conflicting economic interests. A superficial

knowledge of history, such as is imbibed at school, would lead one to think wars in the past have been due to bad rulers instead of good, or to the wickedness of foreigners, or maybe to religious differences; that the last war was caused by the ambitions of the Kaiser, or by his habit of wearing his moustache at an angle of 45 degrees.

The crusades, in particular, are often alleged to have been fought because the Holy Land had fallen into the hands of the infidel Turk, the fact that they barred the trade routes to the East (the major cause) not being considered worthy of mention.

Under capitalism, production is carried on for profit, which profit is not realised by the capitalist until the articles are sold. As they cannot all be sold profitably inside the country of production, the surplus must be sold abroad.

When the capitalist nations came in contact with peoples in backward countries who did not welcome them as traders, they resorted to force of arms and forced their way into these countries. Obviously, this process has limits, and the big capitalist powers were bound to come into conflict over the division of the coveted areas.

When all the avenues of trickery, double-dealing, or "diplomacy," have failed to bring about a satisfactory division, one side or the other plays its trump card—armed force—and the workers are called on to lay down their lives in the interests of their respective masters.

Modern capitalist powers stand little chance of waging war successfully without the support of practically the whole population; for, apart from the huge armies engaged in the actual fighting, the arms and munitions have to be produced and transported, and the troops fed and clothed; smooth working is therefore essential.

This necessary support is forthcoming only because the workers do not realise their slave position, but believe they have interests in common with the capitalists; this belief being assiduously fostered by the whole of the press and the professional politicians.

A typical instance may be given. Mr. Tillet, as chairman of the T.U.C., gave his views, along with prominent capitalists, in the *Daily Herald* of December 27, 1928, on the prospects of trade during 1929:—

If Britain is to recover her industrial prosperity and her lost markets, there must be courage, initiative and competence equal to the past.

Labour has its contribution to make and will respond, if invited. Trade Unionists as well as employers must move with the times in organisation and equipment, and catch the new spirit. I have no fear that the organised working-class movement, or its leaders will fail when the test comes.

The *Herald*, of course, in its leading article comments favourably on Tillet's views. Industrial prosperity could only be "recovered" by those who had formerly enjoyed it, and as the lot of the workers under capitalism has always been poverty, only the employers stand to recover anything, and it is precisely out of the struggle for markets, whether lost or newly discovered, that wars arise. Those who maintain that the workers have mutual interests with the employers in this struggle for markets should therefore maintain that it is to the workers' benefit to engage in the wars arising therefrom, and such individuals, although they are fervent supporters of peace during peacetime, often become equally fervent recruiting agents in wartime, or, as Tillet puts it, they "move with the times."

The Socialist attitude on this subject is clear and definite. Those who do not own the country cannot have it taken from them, and even a complete victory by one capitalist power over another, resulting in the complete subjugation of the vanquished state, would not benefit the workers of the victorious country, and would only mean a change of masters for the workers in the defeated country. The conditions of the workers in victorious Britain are—broadly speaking—similar to those obtaining in defeated Germany, whilst the capitalists of the allied countries have benefited at the expense of their fellow thieves in Germany.

When war broke out in 1914 other so-called working class parties were thrown off their balance and either supported the war or were divided on the subject. The Socialist Party alone pointed out the truth concerning the issues at stake and affirmed the unity of interests of the workers throughout the world and their antagonism of interests with the capitalists throughout the world.

There is a type of propaganda against war which is perfectly sincere but is the outcome of emotion rather than knowledge. This takes the form of drawing attention to the horrors of war, and such books as the recently published "All Quiet on the Western Front" are regarded as excellent anti-war propaganda.

One can readily agree that modern war is a ghastly, horrifying, inglorious destruction of human life, but the mere realisation of this is not sufficient to prevent the workers from supporting war if they think they have an interest in doing so. Many went into the last war fully realising its horrible nature but not its sordid origin. Those who are swayed in one direction by emotion can be swayed in another direction if the emotional pressure brought to bear is sufficiently strong; and we know the power of the press to sway such people.

Then there are those who believe that it is the competition in armaments which is responsible for war, but a little thought should show them that this competition is itself an effect of a cause, and must continue so long as the cause remains.

The fact is that capitalism requires an armed force at its disposal for two reasons: to use against rival powers, and to use against the working class if they attempt to lay their hands on their masters' property. The proposals of the Russian Government, therefore, for complete disarmament were fatuous nonsense equivalent to proposing to the capitalist powers that they commit suicide. All governments rely ultimately on armed might, the Soviet Government included.

The present writer recently heard a worker, unable to meet other criticisms, say "Well, at any rate, it must be admitted that the Labour Party is a peace party." The idea behind such a statement is that wars are caused by the particular statesmen forming the government. This is entirely erroneous. No matter how much disposed towards peace a government may be, when the conditions are ripe for war the government is forced to take action in accordance with the interests of the ruling class, whether that government is labelled Conservative, Liberal, or Labour. So that even granting the Labour Party to be more in favour of settling international disputes by arbitration, it does not alter the fact that war is as likely to occur with "Labour" in the seats of power as it is with the Conservatives or Liberals there. In fact, if the Labour Party have the confidence of the workers to a greater extent than the other two parties it would be more convenient to the capitalist class to have a Labour Government to pave the way should war become inevitable from a capitalist standpoint.

Even if it were possible to abolish war within capitalism, capitalism would still remain, and it is the mission of the Socialist Party not to fight against particular features of the system, but against the system itself.

In conclusion, therefore, let us urge you not to waste your time with futile anti-war movements, but to join with us in working for the overthrow of capitalism and the establishment of Socialism, confident that with the ending of the system will end the danger of war resulting therefrom.

J. L.

KNOWLEDGE.

The following Books can be obtained from Head Office:—

Anarchism and Socialism. Plechanoff. 3/6, paper 1/2
Civil War in France. Marx 2/9.

Conditions of the Working Class in England in 1844. Engels. 5/-

Critique of Political Economy. Marx. 6/6.

18th Brumaire of Louis Napoleon. Marx. 3/6.

Evolution of Property. Lafargue. 3/6, limp 1/6.

Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State. Engels. 3/6.

Poverty of Philosophy. Marx. 6/6.

Revolution and Counter-Revolution. Marx. 3/6, limp 1/6.

Social and Philosophical Studies. Lafargue. 3/6.

Socialism: Utopian and Scientific. Engels. 3/6, limp 1/6. Postage extra.

Contributions are earnestly invited to assist us with the expense of publishing more literature.

S.P.G.B. PROPAGANDA MEETINGS

LONDON DISTRICT.

- Sunday** ... Clapham Common, 6.30 p.m.
Tottenham, West Green Corner, 11.30 a.m.
Tooting, Garrett Lane, Tooting Broadway, 7.30 p.m.
Victoria Park, 4 p.m.
Woolwich, Beresford Square, 7.30 p.m.
Hyde Park, 11.30 a.m.
Paddington, Prince of Wales, 8 p.m.
- Mondays** ... Camberwell, Wren Road, 7.30 p.m.
Clerkenwell, Garnault Place, 8 p.m.
- Wednesdays** ... Forest Gate Station, 8 p.m.
- Thursdays** ... Becontree, Rodney Street, Ilford, 8 p.m.
- Fridays** ... Clerkenwell, Acton St., Grays Inn Rd., 8 p.m.
Hackney, Paragon Road and Mare Street, 8 p.m.
- Saturdays** ... Wood Green, Jolly Butchers Hill, 8 p.m.
Leyton, Corner Grange Park, 7.30 p.m.

HANLEY BRANCH.

- Sundays** ... Hanley Market Square, 7 p.m.
Burslem, St. John Square, 7 p.m.

GLASGOW.

- Mondays** ... Queens Park Gate, 7.15 p.m.
Tuesdays ... West Regent Street, 8 p.m.
Thursdays ... Raebury Street, Maryhill, 8 p.m.

BRANCH DIRECTORY.

- BATTERSEA.**—Sec., 2, Hanbury-road, S.W.11. Branch meets Thursday, 8.30 p.m. at The Waiting Room, Latchmere Baths, entrance in Burns-road. Discussion second Thurs. in month.
- BECONTREE.**—Sec., Hy. Gratton, 4, Drummond Ave., Brooklands, Romford. Branch meets 1st and 3rd Wednesdays at 7.30, at above address.
- BIRMINGHAM.**—Sec. E. Jesper, 35, Rollason-rd., Erdington. Branch meets The Continental Café, Moor St., 1st and 3rd Sundays at 11 a.m.
- CAMBERWELL.**—Branch meets at Camberwell Trades Council Room, 6A, Artichoke Place, Camberwell Green, every Friday at 8.30 p.m. Discussions—public invited. Letters to Secretary at above address.
- CENTRAL.**—Membership obtained only through the Ex. Committee. Applications to General Sec.
- CLERKENWELL.**—Branch meets Wednesdays, 8 p.m., at Emily Davison Club Rooms, 144, High Holborn (corner of Bury Street). Discussion after Branch business—all invited. Sec., at above address.
- EAST LONDON.**—Sec., D. Jacobs, 28, Lyal Road, Bow, E.3. Branch meets 1st and 3rd Mondays at 8 p.m. at Stewart's Cafe, 195, Cambridge Rd., E.2.
- GLASGOW.**—W. Falconer, 128, Blue Vale, Street, Glasgow. Branch meets Friday, 8 p.m., at Herald League Book Stall, 39, Shuttle Street, Glasgow.
- HACKNEY.**—Branch meets Arcadian Cafe, 42, Amherst Road, Hackney, Mondays, 8 p.m., Discussions 9.30. Communication to Sec. as above.
- HANLEY.**—Branch meets Tuesdays, Working Men's Club, Glass-st. Sec., F. Goldstraw, 38, Paddock Street, Hanley.
- ISLINGTON.**—Branch meets Wednesdays, 8.30, at 144, Seven Sister-rd., Holloway, N. Sec., A. Gregory, 24, Goodinge Rd., N.7.
- LEYTON.**—Sec., 396, Lea Bridge-rd., Leyton. Branch meets 8 p.m., Trades and Labour Hall, Grove House, High-rd., second Mondays in month.
- MANCHESTER.**—Sec., W. Addison, 111, West Park-street, Salford, Manchester.—Branch meets 1st and 3rd Thursdays in month, 7.45 p.m.
- PADDINGTON.**—Branch meeting held on 2nd and 4th Fridays, 8 p.m., in room above the Co-operative Stores, 306, Kilburn-lane, W.9 (side door).
- SOUTHEND-ON-SEA.**—Sec., J. Bird, 5 Welling-ton-avenue, Westcliffe-on-Sea.
- TOOTING.**—Sec., Miss N. Fairbrother, 36, Haverhill Road, S.W.12. Branch meets every Friday at 8 p.m. at Tooting Adult School, 971, Garratt-lane, S.W.17.
- TOTTENHAM.**—Secretary, 18, Woodlands Park Rd., N.15. Branch meets Fridays, Room 2, Trades Hall, 7, Bruce Grove. Discussion after branch business. Public invited.
- WALTHAMSTOW.**—Sec., S. E. Williams, 64, Bloxham-rd., Leyton; E.10. Branch meets at Workmen's Hall, High-st., every Monday.
- WATFORD.**—A. Lawson, Sec., 107 Kensington-avenue, Watford. Branch meets Mondays at 8.30 p.m. at Secretary's address.

WEST HAM.—Branch meets Thursdays at 8 p.m. at 167 Romford rd., Stratford. Sec., P. Hallard, 22, Colegrave-rd., Stratford, E.

WOOD GREEN.—All communications to Sec., F. W. Godfrey, 71, Falkland Road, N.8.

WOOLWICH.—Branch meets at 94, Griffin Road, Plumstead. Communications to Secretary at above address.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN.

OBJECT.—The establishment of a system of society based upon the common ownership and democratic control of the means and instruments for producing and distributing wealth by and in the interests of the whole community.

DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great HOLDS— Britain

That society as at present constituted is based upon the ownership of the means of living (i.e., land, factories, railways, etc.) by the capitalist or master class, and the consequent enslavement of the working class by whose labour alone wealth is produced.

That in society, therefore, there is an antagonism of interests, manifesting itself as a class struggle, between those who possess but do not produce and those who produce but do not possess.

That this antagonism can be abolished only by the emancipation of the working class from the domination of the master class, by the conversion into the common property of society of the means of production and distribution, and their democratic control by the whole people.

That as in the order of social evolution the working class is the last class to achieve its freedom, the emancipation of the working class will involve the emancipation of all mankind, without distinction of race or sex.

That this emancipation must be the work of the working class itself.

That as the machinery of government, including the armed forces of the nation, exists only to conserve the monopoly by the capitalist class of the wealth taken from the workers, the working class must organise consciously and politically for the conquest of the powers of government, national and local, in order that this machinery, including these forces, may be converted from an instrument of oppression into the agent of emancipation and the overthrow of privilege, aristocratic and plutocratic.

That as political parties are but the expression of class interests, and as the interest of the working class is diametrically opposed to the interests of all sections of the master class, the party seeking working-class emancipation must be hostile to every other party.

The SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain, therefore, enters the field of political action determined to wage war against all other political parties, whether alleged labour or avowedly capitalist, and calls upon the members of the working class of this country to muster under its banner to the end that a speedy termination may be wrought to the system which deprives them of the fruits of their labour, and that poverty may give place to comfort, privilege to equality, and slavery to freedom.

Those agreeing with the above principles and desiring enrolment in the Party should apply for membership form to secretary of nearest branch or at Head Office.

THE Socialist Standard

The Official Organ of **THE SOCIALIST PARTY** of Great Britain.

No. 301. VOL. 26.]

LONDON, SEPTEMBER, 1929.

[MONTHLY, TWOPENCE.]

THE PLIMSOLL LINE.

Only the older generation remembers the long struggle conducted by Samuel Plimsoll—to whom at last a memorial is to be erected on the Embankment Gardens—to make legal his famous safety load line, now marked on the sides of every British Ship.—(*Daily Chronicle*, August 16.)

Though we do not advocate dependence on others where workers' interests are at issue, and though we are not hero-worshippers, we can appreciate the sterling worth of men like this champion of the seamen's cause. Inseparable from the history of Plimsoll's struggle is the record of a dastardly deed worth recounting, inasmuch as it shows the mercenary nature of capitalist society. Plimsoll was no mere notoriety seeker, but one of the men of his day who could rise above place and pelf. He had a wholesome respect for the working class, especially that hard-working and long-suffering section who sail the seas. In his book, "Our Seamen," he says:—"Riches seem in so many cases to smother the manliness of their possessors . . . their sympathies are reserved for the sufferings of their own class and also the woes of their own class. They seldom tend downward, and they are far more likely to admire an act of courage than to admire the constantly exercised fortitude and the tenderness which are the daily characteristics of a British worker's life—and of the workmen all over the world as well." Entering the House of Commons in 1871, Samuel Plimsoll met with bitter hostility from the vested shipping interests and was ejected from the House for denouncing the ship-owners as "cold-blooded murderers." Hear the words of an eye-witness on the occasion:—

Most of the house and most of the front benches were as ignorant as bull calves of the ways of the merchant service.

Mr. Plimsoll was a very quiet and quaker-like man. Perhaps there was not a fighting man in the house to back him except half-a-dozen Irishmen. Did he sit down in silent funk? Did he admit that the lives of British seamen were of no urgent importance? I can see the brave man now as I saw him then. In half-a-dozen strides he was in front of the mace at the table. With clenched fist and furious voice he threatened and he denounced, "Were the sailors to go down in coffin ships during another winter's storms when the Bill could be passed this session. By God! It must be passed, though all the murdering insurers of rotten ships were there to stop it." It was no use shouting, "Order, order," or "Send for the Sergeant-at-Arms"; Samuel Plimsoll all along meant to save the sailormen and he called out to all England to have the Plimsoll mark made law.—(Quoted by the *Sphere*, August 17th, 1929, from the writings of F. H. O'Donnell, 1913.)

As a result of this agitation, and the consequent feeling aroused, by one man mark you, the Government was forced to push through a temporary bill. So strongly did the vested interests resist the interference with their "right" to murder helpless seamen that it was not until 1890 that the Load Line was fixed by Act of Parliament.

And now for the dastardly deed referred to. In 1906 came the great Liberal Government, with 54 Labour members, and Lloyd George, President of the Board of Trade. Among its wealthy members and supporters were the following shipping magnates:—Lord Pirrie, director of Harland & Wolff's, White Star Line and other shipping companies; Lord Furness, director of six shipping concerns; Sir Owen Phillip, Mark Palmer, Lord Joicey, Lord Rendel, Sir Walter Runciman, Sir William Bowring, R. D. Holt, Lord Mulburnholme, Russel Lea, Hon. J. A. Pease, and so on, and so on, profit without end. Now will you need to

ask why David Lloyd George, ambassador of God Almighty Capital, amended the Merchant Shipping Act, permitting vessels that could least afford to load deeper to do so, to the extent of 7 and 8 inches. The object was to save the ship-owners from the expense of building extra vessels, and the result was very soon apparent in the number of foundering and the consequent enormous loss of life. Numbers of ships went out to sea and were never heard of again. But in this day there was no Samuel Plimsoll, though there were 54 Labour members, who, for the most part, sat silent through it all. Greatly to their credit the late Keir Hardie and H. M. Hyndman carried on a vigorous campaign of protest, the latter even challenged Lloyd George to prosecute for the accusations he levied against him, but the Welsh lawyer was too busy "climbing." We live in a commercial age, and the object of these lines is to call attention to the rottenness of a society in which the noble deeds of the dead can be turned to account, and even honoured, by those who batten and fatten on the living.

MAC.

SIR RAY LANKESTER AND KARL MARX.

The death of Sir Edwin Ray Lankester called forth the following letter, written by Max Beer and published in the *Daily Herald* on August 20th:—

It may interest your readers to learn that Sir E. Ray Lankester was, at the beginning of the 'eighties, an admirer of Karl Marx.

In the archives of the German Social Democracy there are some letters of his to the author of *Das Kapital*. He was one of the dozen mourners who, in March, 1883, followed the hearse of Marx from Haverhill to Highgate Cemetery.

LECTURES

A SERIES OF LECTURES will be given on Sunday evenings during September at 42, Great Dover Street, S.E.1 (near Borough Underground Station).

Commence at 8 p.m. Public Invited.

Admission Free. Questions and Discussion.

ALL QUIET ON THE PARLIAMENTARY FRONT.

As the evenings draw in, it is more and more evident that Socialism will not be here by Christmas. This, we must agree, is disappointing. True, the Labour Government has done its best, but what with the lack of rain, and the holiday season coming on, one must not expect too much. Photographs of Uncle Arthur at Scheveningen, looking the reverse of revolutionary, have appeared in the papers; others of Ramsay in flying kit, so anxious to achieve Socialism in Our Time that he has to resort to the airplane; others again of Snowden, scowling, sneering or smiling. Delightful little paragraphs have appeared depicting the charming home life and complete domestic harmlessness of the Labour Cabinet. Altogether they can be said to have had a good press. Even when they disguised Sidney Webb in the fustian of a Lord, the jeers were fairly restrained. And now, after three months of office, we find capital going further still and saying, "the whole Empire is behind Philip Snowden." Here is a revolution indeed. Three months ago they were disrupters of the Empire; to-day, Snowden talks of its prestige and its rightful foremost place in world affairs.

What has happened? It is very simple. There is no need to expend a great number of words in explaining. During the great European war, the Labour Party was on the side of Capital. In 1924, when they were "in office but not in power," their most outstanding achievement was to threaten revolting workers with the Emergency Powers Act. In 1929 the first jobs they tackle are the safeguarding of capitalist rights in Egypt, the cheaper running of the Navy by arrangement with capitalist rivals, and the squabbling with European capitalists over the sharing of German reparations.

We submit those are not the actions of a party whose object is the overthrow of Capitalism. Briand, Stresemann and Snowden meet round the table as equals. They are equals. Each represents a separate capitalist entity. The workers will realise this as the months and years roll by and their lot remains the same. They will realise that to vote for a working man because he is a working man, and for no other reason, is the height of futility. Capitalism, administered by working men, differs in little from capitalism administered by capitalists. The workers must learn that it is not the

individuals, it is the system that is at fault. They must grasp this fact and hold on to it, that changing the name and not the thing achieves nothing. They must cease to believe such tosh as that recently published in the *New Leader*, wherein the workers were urged to admire Socialism in practice at Bournemouth, Brighton and Blackpool. We hope to have many opportunities of commenting upon the career of foolishness that is now before the Labour Party. The problem is a simple one. The workers who produce all wealth are poor in the midst of plenty. A million of them cannot find a master. Their condition is acute. The remainder are poor, permanently poor. We shall see that the Labour Government has no remedy.

W.T.H.

SOME INTERESTING QUOTATIONS.

"The Times" on the Unsolved Problem of Capitalism.

Virtually, there is no problem of production in industry. In nearly all industrial countries many plants work at less than full capacity, for the real problem with them is to sell and not to produce.—(*Times City Notes*, July 15th.)

* * *

Mr. Snowden on the War.

Let it be remembered (he proceeded) that Great Britain entered the War in support of treaty rights and in defence of the safety and security of other nations. She willingly did that; she willingly sacrificed her blood, not in her own interests. As Lord Balfour said, no vital British interest was menaced when Great Britain entered the War.—(Mr. Snowden, addressing the Hague Conference on Reparations. Report in *Times*, August 9th.)

* * *

The "Morning Post" on Mr. Snowden.

When, for example, he pretended that Great Britain entered the War, not in her own interest, but in defence of others, he was using a sort of cant most offensive to those who know (as we all know who are frank with ourselves) that Great Britain entered the War for the defence of her own existence, which was threatened hardly less directly than the existence of Belgium and France.—(*Morning Post*, August 12.)

* * *

Miss Ellen Wilkinson on the Futility of her Party.

This one simple truth has got to be borne in mind (and stated)—that unemployment is a by-product of Capitalism, and you can't solve it, or even appreciably lessen it, within a system which by its working is bound to create more unemployed. That is the real difficulty of this Government.—(*New Leader*, July 12.)

TORY GOLD IN BATTERSEA.

AN ANCIENT GIBE.

It was our intention, as we stated before the General Election, to run a candidate in North Battersea provided the necessary financial support were forthcoming. Outdoor and indoor meetings were held making known our intention, but when nomination day came the minimum amount necessary had not been secured.

The former M.P. (Mr. Saklatvala) lost his seat because, although he is a reformist politician, he is not a popular politician. Whether it was as a result of gloomy disappointment at the election results, one cannot tell, but supporters of the ex-member for North Battersea have been trying to spread the view that our adopted candidate was intended to conjure money from Tory pockets. This took the form of a question at an open-air meeting addressed by the present writer, and was as follows: "Is it not a fact that Commander Marsden offered to pay Barker's election expenses?" Now of all the things ever said about us, the implication in that question is about the silliest, but when the speaker replied to the question in the negative, he was called a liar by another member of the audience. It has since been established that, in spite of the denial, the statement is being given currency by persons who, it seems, do not relish the idea of a Socialist candidate putting up for the first time in the constituency. We therefore declare here that the statement is entirely untrue. No such offer of financial assistance was made by the Tories or anyone else, and if money were offered from doubtful sources it would be refused by the Socialist Party as it has been refused in the past when that situation has arisen.

While on the subject of the North Battersea election, we notice with interest that the Communist Party, who pleaded poverty as their reason for not contesting more constituencies, were able to spend on Mr. Saklatvala's contest £845 4s. 8d., which is hardly less than the amount (£847 6s.) spent by the Tory, Commander A. Marsden.

The successful Labour candidate spent only £431 2s. 4d. (See Returning Officer's statement, *South-Western Star*, July 5th.)

J. B.

 Send your TINFOIL to the General Secretary at the Head Office—It will help to Raise Funds.

ASPECTS OF THE "WOMAN QUESTION."

(Based on Notes of a series of Lectures on "The Sexes in Evolution.")

(Continued.)

It is not surprising, perhaps, that during the ages when no scientific knowledge existed, when nothing was known regarding the development of life on the earth, that man should have regarded himself as an infinitely superior being, possessing mental and physical qualities which were peculiarly "masculine." Neither is it remarkable that woman, who was supposed to have appeared later on the scene as the result of a surgical operation performed upon him, should have been regarded simply as an adjunct, a being created to satisfy the requirements of the masculine nature. But when the scientific age dawned, when it became possible to trace through the ages the evolutionary development of the human race, it might be thought, especially in the light of modern knowledge, that these antiquated prepossessions would disappear. This is by no means the case.

When man was compelled to turn his attention to the crude agricultural pursuits which woman first of all developed, the so-called superior qualities which he possessed—acquisitions of war and the hunt—enabled him gradually to improve on these rudiments. The changeover from matriarchal to patriarchal forms necessarily involved changed conceptions of relations, both sexual and political, and man's power over woman received the necessary sanction of custom and law. And there it has stood, with slight variations, ever since, with the blessing of the Church behind it. Even when we turn to the most advanced scientific writings we find that the old prejudices are by no means eradicated, and any discussion of the sex question still reveals traces of the old prepossession of man's superiority over woman. Scientists have even, on occasion, gone out of their way to justify the subjection of women. . . .

Now that suffrage is practically universal, there are those who deplore the extension of the franchise to women on the grounds that as women outnumber men they may sweep the board at any and every election in the Labour interest, since the majority of women belong to the working-class. On the other hand, Labour politicians are jubilant, believing it to be a likely consumma-

tion. Strangely enough, the Conservative Government, which conceded this "power" to the women, depended upon them to support their class out of gratitude for the concession. At the time they pointed out that they were democratic enough to recognise and appreciate what the women had done for the country. Since women worked and suffered and paid exactly as the men did, it was only right and proper that the same rights and privileges should be extended to them. Selah! In other words—women had proved their worth as citizens, which, by the way, apparently implies that up to that point they hadn't.

In presenting what is, after all, merely a rough outline of the position of the sexes in society, the interpretation can, of necessity, only be a sketchy one. In the opinion of the Socialist the hopes and fears engendered by the extension of the franchise to women are by no means justified. The Liberal and Conservative Parties seek the support of the women, because they believe they can be bluffed. The Labour Party counts on the women's support also, believing they now possess what the men have long possessed—political liberty—and that the moment has now come when woman will assert herself and strike a blow for social freedom. It is quite true, of course, that the employing class has *always* opposed any "rights" for women, probably actuated by fear that the labour market might suffer, and that, by and by, through a possible extended organisation on the part of men and women an end would come to class rule. Though their fears, at the present stage of working-class political education, are groundless, it was probably this aspect that the Liberal and Conservative Parties had in mind when they solicited the support of the enfranchised women. The mistake made by the Labour Party has been to assume that women were politically intelligent to a certain degree. They are not—for how can women be expected to attain a condition which men have not yet reached after years and years of agitation and education? The sad fact remains—the majority of men and women of the working-class are positively indifferent to the political and

industrial welfare of their own class. Many there are—men and women—who have fought for years to improve the conditions under which workers live, and have given of their best to the end, that some day the workers would wake up and take what was rightly theirs. But ask them—has the task been an easy one? Have they perceived any tangible change in the workers' attitude? Have they received any encouragement even?

It might be asked—did the Socialist not see any usefulness in the extension of the franchise, since the vote is the only sensible weapon with which the working-class can emancipate itself? To which the Socialist might retort—the franchise for a great many years gave the males the power to effect any purpose, but so far it has been utilised to maintain their masters in political power. That means that workers have used their votes against their own interests. Why? Because of political ignorance. The vote is a mighty weapon, used intelligently. But in some respects it is like a razor—one can shave or cut one's throat with it. So that the importance of the vote lies not in the securing of the vote itself, it is in the way it is used. What matters most is the recognition, by men and women alike, of their class position. That can come only by education and study along Socialist lines.

Much of the credit for the women's "victory" has been claimed by those who support what is euphemistically termed the "women's movement." But a more obvious factor was a Government facing disaster. And when a Government, facing the probability of defeat, introduces complete enfranchisement, it can only be because they count on swelling the total number of votes to such an extent as to increase their chances of victory, knowing, as they do, that the already existing electorate is anything but politically wise.

It has been called "The Awakening of Women." If that is true, then God help the men!

TOM SALA.

(To be continued.)

EAST LONDON BRANCH.

THE East London Branch will in future hold Branch Meetings at 141 Bow Road, on Fridays, at 8 p.m. Discussions will be held after Branch business. Public invited. Sympathisers are urged to get into touch with the Secretary at the above address.

"OUR PRIME MINISTER."

To justly appreciate the value of a "Great Man" it is wise to study his early life when he was forming his views. Now, Mr. J. Ramsay MacDonald is a "Great Man"—he must be, because he is Prime Minister—to understand him correctly one must look at his past. Let us do so.

I was very much struck with the ease with which Mr. MacDonald carried his top hat and the dignified way he wore his frock coat. Frankly, I was puzzled, as I took him for "a man of the people, raised from obscurity and clothed with a little temporary authority," as Mr. George Barnes used to say, when he was "doing his bit" at home during the war. But a glance into the past helped me to solve the riddle. I came across an old copy of "To-day," Vol. VII., January-June, 1887, and on page 66 found an article by Mr. MacDonald entitled "A Rock Ahead."

In this article Mr. MacDonald is breaking a lance with certain unnamed Socialists to whom he refers as "censors of Socialism," and in criticising them he makes clear his own position. He writes:—

"Of course, those Socialists who see in every tall hat the mark of a traitor, in every respectable outline the sign of a money-grabber, and in every appeal to reason a bait of the enemy's, will not for a moment allow that the coming revolution is to be directed from the study; to be one, not of brutal need, but of intellectual development; to be, in fact, a revolution of the comparatively well-to-do. But, nevertheless, so it must be, to be of any good. By pandering to all the desires of the very lowest class, we may soon gather round us a mob, and just possibly even make a revolution, but the social reconstruction of society will be further removed from us than ever. And yet I scarcely know if with such material a revolution of any sort would be a possibility."

There, then, you have a fairly clear explanation of the origin of Mr. MacDonald's "statesmanlike" capacities.

As becomes a man who has climbed to position in spite of motor-cars and biscuit factories, Mr. MacDonald had, in his early days, a fitting contempt for mere hewers of wood and drawers of water such as you and I, fellow-worker, and he expressed his view quite plainly. Here is how he put it:—

"Intimately, then, as Socialism concerns labour, and despite the efforts made in cer-

tain quarters to flout all Socialists who have not been ground in the mill of a labourer's position, yet labour as such is simply useless for freeing itself. They tell us that the little glory we have, as heads of creation, is due to our being the last forms developed from the higher animals. And that may be true. But there is a second man in us now. That man is the intellect. Socialism is the first stage of its development. The intellect, as it develops, makes us feel our social evils—poverty, slavery, privilege; and our mental needs—leisure, beauty, hope. We become Socialists. The rude and uncultured masses, as a rule, espouse the same cause because the intellectual atmosphere they breathe has taught them to be discontented. The educated espouse it because of its natural justice. The former is the bad ground, the rock ahead; the latter the fruitful soil . . .

We want men who are clear-headed and far-seeing, men who, by moral force, can command respect, and who, though compromising nothing, know how to be reasonable.

Thus, then, did Mr. MacDonald lay down the path to guide him to his present position as chief of the Cabinet that controls the destinies of this great empire. He most emphatically knew "how to be reasonable." And if, at election time, he exhausted himself working up constituencies by grand tours he was, no doubt, helping the "uncultured masses" to breathe the "intellectual atmosphere." To people such as we are, motor tours through the deserts may appear almost as curious a way of gaining information of the practical steps necessary to achieve Socialism, as, for instance, Mr. Thomas's trip to Canada to solve the unemployment question in England. But that is the difference between culture and lack of culture, as Mr. Webb has demonstrated by taking a peerage in order to abolish privilege, and Mr. Snowden by taking a firm stand on behalf of the British property-owners at the Hague in order, no doubt, to abolish property. All this is very complicated and puzzling to us. But then we are but the uncultured mass whose business it is to present our backs as ladders for the use of the cultured people with ideals who, as they assure us, will bring Jerusalem to this green and pleasant land if only we will be patient and wait long enough.

If these gentlemen, in the course of their climbing, enjoy good dinners, nice wines, and grand tours, is it not fitting for cultured gentlemen like them? And if we go without

our dinners, drink water (if it rains) and tour the labour exchanges, while presenting our backs for the use of the climbers, well, is it not fitting for uncultured mugs like us?

I can hardly do better than finish this eulogy with the closing words of Mr. MacDonald's article:—

Remember, then, if one of thy members offend thee, to cut it off and cast it from thee, for it is more profitable that one member should perish than that the whole body should be cast into the hell fire of failure.

GILMAC.

LIVING THE DOUBLE LIFE.

"So hard it seems that one must bleed
Because another needs will bite."

—Meredith.

In one of his books, Fabre, the noted French entomologist, gives a wonderful description of the manner in which the Spheg wasp stings its victim in three places in order that its grub, when it wakes up, will find an adequate supply of fresh, living food immediately available.

This is a case of simple, or partial, parasitism, of which there appear to be several degrees existing in nature. Sometimes an organism will be parasitic for only a portion of its career, others are completely parasitic for the whole of their existence. Whatever the degree the association is generally specific and is bound up solely with the problem of nutrition.

Parasitism may be defined as one organism living upon another without rendering any useful service in return. When one individual directly kills another, the relation is called predatism; when one party feeds upon another, without killing it directly, the relation is called parasitism. Various theories have been advanced to account for the origin of parasitism, but perhaps a good covering explanation would be that parasitism arose as a consequence of the discovery of the successful application of the law of least effort. Whatever their origin, the existing forms probably represent degenerate forms of former useful species.

This brings us to the consideration of another and more intimate phase of the subject, easily recognised by the discerning worker—social parasitism. Essentially this is the same as the organic variety so far as the end result is concerned—the acquisition and accumulation of the means of subsistence and enjoyment without effort. There is, of course, no moral involved, the question does not enter at all. The ability on

the part of one section of society to extract the productive power of another section and to appropriate the results of the application of that power, is based entirely on the relatively unchallenged possession of the requisite machinery to enforce subjection. In nature parasitism on the part of certain organisms is known to possess what is termed "survival value," that is, this feature plays a successful part in the struggle for existence. Not so in human society. Parasitism in human society owes its success to the fact that those who practise it control the means of enslaving their victims while at the same time permitting them sufficient to keep them from dying and so ensure an abundance of material to serve their needs. Though there are two classes in society—a slave class and a parasitic class—and though one class occupies what is termed a higher social rank, it is not because of its biological fitness to survive, measured by nature's laws, but merely because in the course of the development of society certain individuals have seen their opportunity to relieve themselves from the necessity of providing a living by their own efforts, and in the course of time to improve the opportunity by introducing the necessary legal sanction in accordance with the degree of development.

It was mentioned that the organic parasite was generally specific—so is the social parasite. Yet he is not so discriminating in the choice of his victims. The wasp will select a particular caterpillar as its prey, but to the social parasite all are victims—red, black, yellow or white. One animal species, instead of killing its prey, will often subdue another and compel it to perform some service for it, as is the practice among certain ants. On the other hand *man is the only instance known to Biology of an animal preying on its own kind.* This is specificity with a vengeance!

As already suggested, this parasitic impulse is not by any means a primitive feature of human society. It does not appear in savage society to-day, any more than do the regular features of civilised society—slavery, robbery, murder, etc. It is essentially a product of "civilisation." In another particular the social parasite resembles the Spheg in that he rarely fails to provide an abundance of material for the sustenance of his progeny. The only difference between the victim of the Spheg and the victim of the social parasite is that the former is stung

in three places and the latter in one—but quite as effectively nevertheless. Despite the beliefs of many of those who claim to have the cause of the workers at heart, an accurate examination of the factors at work reveals the fact that the working classes are exploited once, and once only—that is, at the point of production.

Man's conquest of his environment has made possible a remarkable increase in the productivity of every kind of material wealth. But hand in hand with this development has gone an appalling increase in the differences of prosperity and well-being. This concentration of wealth into the hands of a relatively small section of the human race has meant the demoralisation and degradation of literally millions. It is quite true, as history will testify, that the emphasis upon luxury, idleness and extravagance has been just as demoralising to those who hold the wealth, but such an outcome is only in keeping with a system where slavery is practised. Degeneration is the natural corollary of a parasitic mode of life.

All sorts of remedies are forthcoming whenever the question of the extermination of organic parasites arises. Even the individual whom we are trying to reach will instantly produce a remedy for the elimination of parasites on the physical body when required, but appears to be at a loss, even if cognisant of its existence, when it comes to the question of eliminating parasites on the body politic. Hence the Socialist Party of Great Britain.

TOM SALA.

EAST LONDON.

LECTURES

The following lectures have been arranged by the East London Branch to be given at

141 BOW ROAD, E.3.

On FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 6th,
and FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 20th.

SUBJECT, September 6th—

"The Truth about the Rates and Taxes"

Speaker: W. E. McHAFFIE.

SUBJECT, September 20th—

"Our Case Against the Reformers"

Speaker: A. JACOBS.

Public Invited.

Admission Free.

Questions and Discussion

Commence at 7.45 p.m.

OFFICIAL NOTICE.

All communications for the Executive Committee, Subscriptions for the SOCIALIST STANDARD, Articles, and Correspondence submitted for insertion therein, should be addressed—The Socialist Party of Great Britain, 42, Great Dover Street, London, S.E.1, to whom Money Orders should be made payable.

The meetings of the Executive Committee are held at the Head Office, every Tuesday, at 7.30 p.m.

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTIONS.

Twelve Months, post free... .. 2s. 6d.
Six Months, post free... .. 1s. 3d.

The Socialist Standard,

SEPT.,



1929

The Cotton Dispute.

The dispute in the cotton industry arose out of a decision by various employers' associations to reduce wages by 12½ per cent. from July 29th. The operatives balloted on the question of accepting the reduction and decided by a large majority not to do so. Conferences arranged by the Ministry of Labour failed to secure agreement and a lock-out of nearly 500,000 operatives began on July 29th. The position of the locked-out workers was not improved by a recommendation of the Executive Council of one section, the Operative Spinners Amalgamation, in favour of accepting the principle of a reduction, the amount to be decided in course of negotiation. A delegate meeting, however, by a substantial majority refused to give its executive authority to enter into negotiations on this basis, and after 11 days the workers' side was again united in its refusal.

On August 10th the Prime Minister intervened, and on August 15th it was announced that both sides had agreed to arbitration. Work was resumed at the old rates pending the award of the arbitrators, who were empowered to examine the merits of the employers' demand for a reduction and determine "whether and, if so, to what extent, the employers' claim to a reduction of wages is sustained." (*Manchester Guardian*, August 16th.) Both sides pledged them-

selves to abide by the award. The arbitrators were five in number, including the Chairman. Two, Mr. C. T. Cramp and Mr. A. G. Walkden, were trade union officials.

The plea put forward by the masters was the usual one that trade is bad and a wage reduction would help the industry out of its depression.

Mr. Ogden, President of the Amalgamated Weavers, gives the answer. He tells how the same plea was made in 1920, and again in 1922.

In 1920 wages were 215 on the list. I believed that a reduction of wages would help trade and give better employment. We accepted a reduction of 70 per cent. on list prices. The improvement did not materialise, but two years later the employers came to us again and asked for another 50 per cent cut. This, in all, meant a reduction of between 12s. and 15s. a week. . . . (*Daily Herald*, August 1st.)

The pre-stoppage average pay of the men operatives was 47/- a week (according to the Ministry of Labour), and

there are married men piecers in the spinning rooms who are paid as little as 25s. a week. Four-loom weavers on full time, with all their looms running, get only about £2 a week and to have full time at the mills and all looms fully working is very far indeed from the general experience in the cotton industry to-day. (*Daily Herald*, August 16th.)

Further reductions in pay will no more solve that ever-present problem of capitalism—over-production—than did the earlier ones. The Labour Party's alternative solution is re-organisation and amalgamation with a view to increasing sales by means of cheaper and more efficient production. This means, in effect, making still more fierce the competition between Lancashire and its foreign rivals—a "remedy" which will but aggravate the disease.

There has been much mutual congratulation because arbitration was accepted and thus "reason" triumphed over "force." It is necessary to point out, therefore, what is the real function and nature of arbitration. It is no more than a means of measuring up the strength of the opposing sides at a given moment and giving an award accordingly. Arbitration does not obviate the need for the workers to organise with a view to withholding their labour when conditions enable them, by so doing, to bring a certain pressure to bear. It does not bring peace into industry, nor supplant the struggle between those who own the machinery of production and those who operate

it; nor does it materially affect the level of wages.

Professor Henry Clay, President of the Section of Economic Science of the British Association, dealt with this subject in a general way in his 1929 address. (See *Times*, 3rd August, 1929.)

He summed up as follows:—

Arbitration did not, because it could not, materially affect the economic factors that ultimately determine what wages can be paid; and the course of wages, as formulated by arbitration, was much the same as it would have been—with a time-lag and less uniformity—had there been no arbitration. In other words, the arbitration authorities interpreted—and interpreted with fair accuracy—forces which they could not in any case control.

We would, in passing, commend to the operatives two things for them to ponder over. One is the fact that wage reductions are as much the order of the day when capitalism is administered by the Labour Party as at other times, and the Labour Government, like its predecessors, declines to side with the workers against the employing class.

The second is a gem from the *Daily News*.

The *Daily News* wholeheartedly welcomed the setting-up of the Arbitration Board, a Board, be it remembered, whose terms of reference were to consider a reduction in wages. Four days later (20th August) its editorial contained a little sermon on revolution. It pointed out first that the British working man "is not impressed by talk of revolution."

Then it added, with unconscious humour, "He prefers to listen to sensible talk about higher wages and better conditions."

The award is for a reduction in pay of approximately 6¼%, thus reducing the employer's wages bill by £2,225,000 a year (see *Daily Telegraph*, 24th August). It was agreed to by all the members of the Board, including the two trade union officials.

The Board's award will doubtless leave the British working man still preferring to listen to "sensible talk about higher wages."

TO OUR READERS. PLEASE NOTE.

The "Socialist Standard" can be obtained from the following Newsagents

Coombs & Fancourt, 541, Barking Road, Plaistow.
A. E. Cohen, 297, Barking Road, East Ham.
H. Williams, 86, Barking Road, Canning Town.
C. W. Honess, 63, Stratford Road, Plaistow.
H. S. Bailey, 42, Tower Bridge Road, S.E.
A. Dennington, 518, Romford Road, Manor Park.
Brewster, 155, Barking Road.
W. Villiers, 139, Lower Road, Rotherhithe, S.E.
A. E. Compton, 93 Commercial Rd., Peckham, S.E.

THOUGHTS AT THE PICTURES.

We thought our town was well supplied with cinemas, but three months ago another opened. This was really a grand affair, with everything right up to recent date. There was a beautiful copper dome, surmounting an artistic tiled front, and when all the lights were twinkling and reflected in the small lake before the building, it was like a dream palace. And then you walked through the polished doors and up the marble stairs, helping yourself along with the heavy brass handrails until you came to the paybox. Here stood an ambassador (I am sure he was an ambassador, for he was covered in gold lace), who always made the same mistake. He always assumed that we were either American oil-kings or else ex-sergeant-majors, for he immediately called out, "Seats at 5/9, 3/6 and 2/4." He never mentioned the 6d. and 1/- ones. He made us feel somewhat cheap, but we found he was paid to do that and thus increase his master's takings, so we paid our shillings and went in. And inside! What a vision! To the great majority of people in our town, whose homes are furnished by Tallyman, Gombeen and Tick, Ltd., and decorated by Woolworth's, the new cinema must appear the last thing in the palatial. Gilt and tinsel, plush and velvet, silken curtains and orange glow-lamps, all go to make the nearest approach to fairyland most of us have ever known. There was a cinema organ capable of making 591 different kinds of noise. I will not venture to express my own ill-balanced and highly prejudiced opinion of it, but will simply state that the majority of my fellow citizens were brought into a state of ecstasy by it. And then there was the orchestra of about twenty musicians. I mention this feature last, because we were assured that it was a highly efficient body under the baton of the well-known conductor, Mr. So-and-So. One must admit that when they played music they were a joy, a pure, unrestrained joy, but when they introduced those orgies of hoots, squeals and death-rattles that are mis-called dance music, they were not a joy.

However, I mention them last for another reason that will be presently apparent. I did not go to the cinema again, because I found that in spite of the fairy-like exterior, the beautiful interior, the organ, the orchestra and all the rest, there appeared upon the screen nothing but the slushiest of slush. One is not entertained by slush.

But there came a day when the owner of the luxurious building informed his "esteemed patrons" and the world at large that, true to the policy of keeping abreast with modern developments, and sparing no expense, he would inaugurate the newest scientific wonder, the talking picture.

So as soon after the opening night as possible, we again paid a visit to the hall of luxury. There were the shaded lights, the marble floor, the painted sky on the ceiling, the courteous attendants as before, and, as we entered, the organ was playing one of the Indian love lyrics. It was not until the great feature, the talking picture, came on, that we noticed a difference. The orchestra had disappeared. Where previously had sat some twenty men in dress suits, producing melody of charm and vigour, there was a boarded expanse, covered with coloured bunting and artificial flowers. Yes! Gay bunting and paper roses. He had "spared no expense" with a vengeance. It was the tomb of the orchestra. All its members had been sacked. Instead of their merry fiddling, all the noises that are intruded to charm a cinema audience, proceeded from a machine situated in the orchestra's tomb. I need not tell you what I thought of the film, or of the talkie device, which has obvious wonderful possibilities. But I could not keep my mind from reverting to a little argument I had had with a friend during the day on unemployment.

He had retailed the old, time-worn phrases as to its cause and cure that the Press provides each day for the satisfaction of its readers. He had admitted, willingly admitted, that the introduction of machinery displaced labour, but urged that effect was only temporary as, owing to the cheapening of costs, prices fell, leading to a bigger demand than ever, when the displaced workers were rapidly re-absorbed. I tried to apply this line of reasoning to the sacked orchestra but I am afraid it did not fit. And yet my friend was only saying what the Capitalist Press says. Another statement he retailed from the same source was that men displaced from an industry by the introduction of machinery, eventually found work in the making of that machinery. There seemed to be a flaw in this reasoning, too. I could not conceive of those twenty musicians selling their instruments in a glutted market, and setting out to find the place where the wonderful talkie machines are made, in the hope that their skill as makers of melody would

avail them as makers of machines. Had they been so exceedingly simple as to act upon those lines, it is quite possible they would have been unable to get near the factory for crowds of other musicians similarly made redundant, and crowds of real engineers already seeking employment.

Another argument he used, or rather quoted, was that unemployment was caused by cheap foreign labour. And yet these machines were the product of highly-paid American labour. I heard later that a British talkie is now being marketed costing but a third of the American product. Even this information did not seem to me to be of great comfort to the starving musician. Whether the machine was made by labour aristocrats or sweated coolies, the effect on the musician seemed the same. However, thinking over these things interfered with my appreciation of the film, and as my friend was not there I could not ask him to explain his ingenious theories in the presence of the awkward facts. I must recommend him to make a little study of the case of the cinema musician and his sudden and dramatic displacement by the machine, and then go over his theories over again. Perhaps he will see that the reason the musicians are sent out to starve, whilst a machine does their work, is because the cinema is privately owned and it is to the interest of the proprietor to substitute a cheaper music maker if he can, for he thus enlarges the amount of his profit. It is nothing to him that the human musicians starve if they cannot find a hirer. He will tell them he is not a philanthropic institution. He is not in business for the good of his health or the good of his employees. If they are wise, they will take him at his word. He is not in business for their benefit. Then they must see that the private ownership of their means of livelihood is incompatible with their good. They will see further, that the whole of this society of ours is run upon the same basis, and that their unemployment is not to be distinguished from unemployment in general. Their problem is only part of the whole problem, and the whole problem can only be solved by a universal remedy. We say that the only remedy suggested, so far, that has stood every sort of criticism, is Socialism. All our means of livelihood are privately owned, and all of us workers are liable to be sent packing whenever our hirers can find a cheaper substitute. How long are we going to stand it? Why should we

not own our own means of livelihood? Why should a relatively small and parasite class dictate to the vast mass of people when they shall work and when not? Let us take possession of the things that are vital to our very existence. We make them, we operate them, we repair them and renew them. We do everything but own them. Without us the whole of the machinery in the world, beautiful as it is, clever as it is, ingenious as it undoubtedly is, is so much junk. Let us make the land, the factories, the

machines and the tools of production, common property, and then perhaps, instead of a machine making men into paupers, we shall welcome every machine that lightens labour, for it will bring us holidays and increased leisure. The system wherein the means whereby all live are commonly owned and administered, is called Socialism. That is what we are aiming at, and we want a million workers to say definitely they want it, and are prepared to help get it. Will you be one?
W. T. H.

THE DICTATORSHIP IN RUSSIA.

"The Communist Party of the Soviet Union." By V. Molotov. Published by Modern Books, Ltd. 80 pp. Price: One Shilling.

This book deals very frankly with the internal problems of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

The Socialist Party of Great Britain has consistently maintained that the upheaval in Russia accomplished the overthrow of the absolute monarchy, and was a revolution only in the sense that the power of the landowners was shattered, and the obstacles to development along Capitalist lines were swept away. In the early days of the Bolshevik régime, the Communist Parties in this and other countries claimed that Russia was the first country to achieve Socialism. Whilst due credit was given the Bolsheviks for their intentions and actual achievements, we exposed this harmful contention—even at the risk of antagonising would-be supporters who failed to grasp the real significance of Russian events. Our standpoint has been amply justified by the evidence during the last ten years or so, and the Communist Parties do not as often make this untenable assertion, realising, perhaps, that conditions in Russia could not be cited as an advertisement for Socialism. There is, however, one erroneous and harmful assertion that is still being spread about, namely, that in Russia the working class is supreme, or, in their own vague phraseology, that there is a "Dictatorship of the Working-class."

This assertion is made repeatedly in Molotov's book, but, unfortunately for the author, he has himself supplied in this work the evidence which proves the absurdity of his claim.

In the first chapter (p. 13) he states:—

Our Party cannot be regarded as separate from the mechanism and the whole system of the proletarian dictatorship. The Party is one of the most important organs of that dictatorship, it embodies within itself the leading rôle of the working-class in the proletarian revolution.

From this quotation the impression is gained that in the Communist Party of the Soviet Union there is a preponderance of working-class members, but this is not, and never has been, the case.

The following quotation is from page 16:—

The Party decided at its Thirteenth Congress that more than half of its members must be workers from the bench; that was more than four years ago. That task could not be realised within a year, and it has not been realised as yet. A year ago the Central Committee again resolved to take up this task, which was to be realised in the course of two years. The year which has elapsed since that decision of the Central Committee has shown that if we proceed at the present rate of recruiting workers into the Party, that task will not be accomplished by the end of the two years.

So it is evident that in spite of periodical "recruiting drives," working-class members are still in a minority in the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. When we take into consideration a statement (p. 22) that the proportion of industrial workers in the Party has remained practically stationary since the beginning of 1925, the prospects of achieving their limited objective in the course of the next few years is extremely doubtful.

IS THE RUSSIAN WORKING-CLASS COMMUNIST?

On page 23 we are told that, according to the Central Statistical Department, there were 7,148,000 industrial workers (including factory and transport workers, agricul-

tural labourers, builders, and handicraft workers) in the U. S. S. R. in 1927-1928. The proportion of these in the Party is 7.7 per cent. For factory workers only, numbering 2,900,000, the proportion is 11.9 per cent. Amongst transport workers Communists constitute 14 per cent.; amongst building workers and workers in small and handicraft industries there are 5 per cent. Communists; the oil-workers and workers in the printing industry have the highest percentage of Communists (18.5 per cent.); the leather, metal, chemical, and food workers have a percentage of Communists slightly below this figure, whilst agricultural workers lag behind with only 1 per cent. It is true, of course, that figures can be juggled with, but the magician is not born who could prove from these figures that the phrase "Communist Russia" is other than a figment of pious imaginations. The only deduction to be drawn is that 7.7 per cent. of an "insignificant" fraction of the population of the U.S.S.R. (i.e., the industrial workers) are "Communists," and only a very tiny percentage of the "overwhelming mass" (i.e., the peasants, etc.) is "Communist," and that this 7.7 per cent. of all industrial workers constitutes only a minority (42 per cent.) in a party which claims to be the party of the working-class.

Even so, it may be urged, does not the huge aggregate of 1½ million members of the C.P. prove that the population of Russia is far more advanced, politically, than that of any other country? Where else in the whole world can be found such a huge body of Marxists? But Molotov himself informs us that membership need not necessarily imply the possession of Socialist knowledge or even a Socialist outlook.

IS THE LEVEL OF RUSSIAN COMMUNISTS HIGH?

It may quite fairly be inferred that Molotov's work would not be needed if all was well with the Party of the U.S.S.R. On page 14 he states:—

But the question of the development of the Party was always bound up primarily with the question of bringing the most progressive elements of the working-class into its ranks.

Parallel with this the Party has, in the course of the last ten or eleven years, keenly considered the question of cleansing its ranks of alien elements, of people who joined it under false colours, and of degenerates.

Intensive recruiting of working men and women to the Party was inevitably bound up with the purging of the Party organisations of socially and ideologically alien elements.

Again on page 25:—

Many examples could be given to show that non-party workers complain of the low cultural and political level of Communists. These are facts.

On page 28 he writes:—

The figures on the October recruitment show that 45 per cent. or almost half of the new workers accepted to the Party have an industrial standing of less than 5 years.

And on page 34:—

It must be realised that we cannot postpone any further the problem of a cardinal improvement, the question of cleansing and renovation of our rural ranks. If we are not simply talking, but are seriously undertaking to advance and gradually to transform agriculture, the present make-up of our rural organisations can by no means be satisfactory to us. *We find in our rural organisations a considerable percentage of elements incapable of realising these tasks, elements who even work directly against their realisation.* (Our italics.)

On page 53 there is a letter of resignation from a member of the Party. The following is an extract therefrom:—

The workers say it is high time to have a general cleansing of the Party, and the fact that many are labelled as workers need not stop us, for under this label plenty of filth has crept into the Party. Let there be but half of the members left, but the Party should be of flint and not of jelly. . . . If you throw all self-seekers out of the Party, for which the help of the broad non-party masses is necessary, resignations will become less frequent.

And finally on page 59:—

On the other hand, an out-and-out opportunist Right deviation from the Leninist line has lately raised its head in the Party. . . . The Right deviation has entered the scene at a moment when our economic situation has become acute. But the Right deviation is not exclusively a result of the economic situation of this year. The roots of the Right Wing tendency are no doubt deeper than that.

The Right deviation cannot be regarded as a temporary and rapidly passing phenomenon. (Our italics.)

The above quotations are ample proof that the Socialist movement need not look exclusively to Russia for guidance in the tasks which lie before it.

THE RURAL PARTY ORGANISATIONS.

In the early days of the Bolshevik regime, and right up to the present time, we have pointed out that the existence of a population which is 80 per cent. peasant in character, would prove not only a stumbling block, but an insuperable obstacle to the attainment of Socialism in Russia. The Bolsheviks have throughout attempted to apply Lenin's formula:—

"The supreme principle of the dictator-

ship is to preserve the alliance of the proletariat and the peasantry, so that the former may retain its leading position in the government."

In practice, however, the application of this formula has tended to strengthen the position of the peasantry, particularly the rich peasants, whose influence acts as a brake on all attempts even at land "nationalisation." Molotov gives figures of the Central Statistical Department which show that the rich farmers constitute a far higher relative percentage of Rural Party members than any other category, and, further, that the relative strength of workers in the Rural Party organisations is only 25 per cent., agricultural labourers working for wages being about 8 per cent. In view of these facts it is not surprising to find that Government schemes for the reconstruction of agriculture are rendered abortive. Regarding the Government farms, about which we have heard such rosy accounts, Molotov states:—

Nine-tenths of the government farms have no Communist nuclei. Only 7,280 workers on government farms, out of a total of 140,000 belonging to the agricultural union, e.g., 5 per cent., are Communists. Such is the state of affairs in the government farms. (P. 32.)

The position in relation to the collective farms is much the same:—

But here is a remarkable thing about the question of the rôle of the Party organisation in collective farming. Only a little over 4 per cent. of all rural Communists belong to collective farms. Of the 311,000 rural Communists only a little over 13,000 belong to collective farms. The fact that only 4 per cent. of the Communist farmers belong to collective farms is very ominous.

With regard to the success in organising collective farms, an illustration is afforded by the following passage:—

The non-Party peasants gladly came in, but the rich Party member, Ivan Gussey, categorically refused to join us for fear that our farm should fall to pieces and that he would not get his land back.

By this refusal he undermined the organisation. Ivan Beliakov agitates against the collective farm, telling the peasants that the Party is wrong in urging them to organise collective farms. We have quite a few such Party members. The well-to-do Communists who possess their own farms not only do not agitate in favour of collectivism, but are definitely against it. (P.33.)

The suggested remedy of cleansing the ranks of alien elements, however, will not help to put Socialist ideas into the heads of the "overwhelming mass," who have no desire to assist in schemes of "Socialist

reconstruction" against their immediate interests. What the peasants want is private ownership.

So much for "the alliance with the peasantry" and the "leadership of the working-class"! But other sores are exposed in the book.

THE RISE OF BUREAUCRACY.

Communists are apt to talk largely about "smashing the State machinery" and "building our own State," but when the Bolsheviks came into power they found the working-class was inexperienced, and that very few among them were capable of organising the industries of the country, owing to lack of technical knowledge and training. The Bolsheviks were compelled therefore to rely upon technical experts and men skilled in administrative functions, who were, in many instances, hostile to them and friendly to the old regime. Although much has been done since then to train members of the working-class for these vital positions, it is nevertheless admitted that "the old officialdom of the apparatus leaves its imprint on some of the Communists working there" (p. 37). In the Communist Party of the Soviet Union there are no less than 35 per cent. of Government office workers. Obviously, as in the case of the rich farmers, a considerable proportion of these have joined the Party from motives other than the advancement of Socialism. On page 41 Molotov says plaintively, "Is not perhaps the reason why we had so many excesses in applying Article 107 (which deals with the concealment of grain by peasants) and general distortion in the work of our local institutions, that rich peasant and White Guard elements get into some of the organs of our Government machinery and deliberately distort the policy of the Soviet Government, and mock the instructions of the superior government and Party institutions without ever being punished for it?"

So it will be seen that Russia is by no means immune from the diseases common to all capitalist countries.

THE TRADE UNIONS.

The existence of Trade Unions, which we are told embrace nine-tenths of the workers, is an indication that the class-struggle is just as much a reality in Russia as elsewhere. As might be expected, these institutions suffer in full measure from the defects which characterise them in all countries. Molotov complains that the "lea-

ders" have lost contact with the masses and are mainly reactionary in outlook, whilst "there is much to be desired in the development of trade-union democracy" (page 49).

It is shown that Managers of Trade Unions are capable of evicting tenants as brutally as any British slum house-owners. Some shocking examples of Jew-baiting in large factories reveal an appalling backwardness amongst the workers in the grasp of elementary Trade Union principles.

There certainly appears to be much scope for Socialist propaganda amongst the Russian Trade Unionists.

With regard to the Co-operatives, they have the same "petit-bourgeois" outlook as their counterparts in other countries. There is a casual allusion to the Red Army, showing that in it there are about 100,000 Communists (page 20). As the Red Army is about 800,000 strong, this is 12½ per cent.

The remedy advanced by the author for all the diseases encountered by the Bolsheviks within their Party is to carry on a struggle against each of them. In no instance is an attempt made to find and destroy the cause of the disease.

There is one way by which the Bolsheviks could mitigate the effects of these diseases and others which will of necessity arise from the economic conditions, and that is to make the utmost use of their opportunities to spread Socialist ideas broadcast amongst the workers in Russia. No other course can replace this. "Make Socialists" is a sounder, if a less soundful, slogan than any yet coined in Russia.

The book could be improved by the deletion of much repetition of the same arguments and phrases. Otherwise it is forcefully written and contains useful data.

W.J.

BATTERSEA.

A LECTURE

will be given under the auspices of the Battersea Branch on

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 19th,
In the WAITING ROOM, LATCHMERE BATHS
(entrance in Burns Road).

Speaker—
COMRADE GINSBURG.

Subject—
"Bernard Shaw's Applegate."

Commence at 8.30 p.m. Public Invited.
ADMISSION FREE. QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION.

"PHEASANTS AND MEN."

By "Medicus." Old Royalty Book Publishers. Price, 3s. 6d. 255 pages.

"Medicus" is evidently a doctor in a rural area—"Clayshire"—which bears a marked resemblance to Lincolnshire. His aim in writing the book is to portray the mastery which the landowners exercise over the lives of all who live by the land. He knows his types and introduces a number of incidents which make interesting reading. It must, however, be confessed that the love episodes, dragged in to please the reader of modern romantic fiction, are too slight and are not handled with sufficient skill to make a very effective novel.

The story shows how an agricultural labourer holding ideas that are against the economic interests of his employer, the landed gentry, is hounded down and becomes a marked man, his means of livelihood gone. Louth, the man in the story, assaults one of his master's foremen for an unjust accusation of theft made against him and having previously been suspected of rebellious ideas, he is prosecuted and heavily fined. His master dismisses him and he is unable to get further employment. The tenant farmers fear the wrath of their land lords, the "gentry," and the owner farmers are hand-in-glove with them, so that Louth is refused everywhere.

The justices who try Louth are all the landed gentry from the immediate neighbourhood, and agree that Louth's behaviour is a direct menace to their interests as a class, and he must be suppressed. They systematically hound the man from that time forth. Louth's master, although a thoroughly gross and uncouth individual, is regarded as of the same class as the gentry because of his position as owner farmer and possessing great wealth. Lord Prentice, a good-natured, inept kind of man, secretly pays Louth's fine and gets him a job on the road. The rest of the gentry are upset at this, but cannot find out who did it. They succeed in getting Louth's wages cut down and nip in the bud the endeavours of his sons to obtain employment. Louth's daughter Mary is taken on as a maid in Lord Prentice's service and meets her affinity in Lord Prentice's son John. This love affair is the "thread of romance" described as running through the tale. The cover itself, by a faintly suggestive picture, gives the book all the appearance of a novel by Victoria Cross, but the "affair" is quite

decorous. The lady in her capacity as maid takes John his morning tea to his bedroom, sits upon the bed and feeds him with bread and butter, both murmuring sweet nothings the while. The "romance" finishes by Lord John marrying good little Mary in the approved *Peg's Paper* style.

Louth is left a legacy of three hundred pounds and rents some land from one of the gentry who let it to him with the express idea of watching this small-holding idea fail. Contrary to expectations, instead of Louth being once more humiliated, with the help of manures, etc., he enriches his poor land, keeps poultry, and he and his sons begin to make money. Then the landowner puts more pressure on him. He raises his rent and gets the assessment committee to raise his rateable value. This enrages Louth, and at the election Louth opposes Lord Prentice's son John, and had it not rained would have won the day. The brain of the gentry, Scutcheon Mamby, goes mad, and as he was the magistrate who could always find a way to convict the most innocent of victims, the stuffing seems to drop out of the gentry and the story finishes by Mary being introduced by Lord Prentice's plebian mother (she had been an actress) to her friends and assuring Mary that old Louth's future was now assured.

The author, although no doubt possessing sympathy with the agricultural workers, does not clearly appreciate their social subjection. He points out that the people who make the laws also punish those who offend against them, and that it is the people who possess who make the laws. Thus Lord John enters Parliament as a property-owner and his father acts as magistrate to enforce the laws his son helps to make.

These facts, however, are very well realised by those who dwell in rural districts and the position is much the same in the towns, although perhaps not so apparent. Most labourers in the country realise that it is hopeless to take any troubles with their master to court. They know that the owner or tenant farmers are backed up by the magistrates on all occasions. It is not only, however, the gentry who are magistrates. The farmers themselves, especially when retiring, are often made J.P.'s and are worse tyrants than the former. They are more feared because, having been in personal contact with the labourer, they know just how to terrorise their victims. The labourers certainly do not, as the book suggests, go in such fear of the gentry as they do the

farmers. So long as they keep out of court they rarely meet. The gentry to them are like their god, living behind iron gates instead of gold. The parson acts as high priest and intermediary between them. The author also gives one the impression that the farmers rather fraternise with the gentry, but this is hardly true. The farmers, schoolmasters, publicans and tradespeople, usually have their own Buff lodges and hunting clubs, and their social activities, fetes and flower shows, etc., are sometimes graciously patronised by the gentry, who will deign to open any charitable show that is going to help the poor and take them off of their own doorstep; and then as graciously fade away again. The doctor and God's servant are accepted as runners-up to them.

Louth, in the story, is supposed to possess more than the average intelligence of his mates. He, however, utters no revolutionary or enlightening speeches and really acts rather stupidly in not clearing out when he came into his money and getting away from the people who had personal animosity towards him.

The only real points of interest to a Socialist are the facts which show how the laws are framed and administered in the interests of the possessing class. The book shows the severity of the game laws even on trifling thefts, but does not try to show that all the "Thou shalt not steal" laws are based upon a society which allows one section of the community to possess and not produce, and the other, the vast majority, to produce and possess nothing, eking out a miserable existence on an insufficient wage that makes stealing almost a necessity. Mrs. O.

S.P.G.B. PROPAGANDA MEETINGS

LONDON DISTRICT.

- Sunday** ... Clapham Common, 3.30 p.m.
Tottenham, West Green Corner, 11.30 a.m.
Tooting, Garrett Lane, Tooting Broadway, 7.30 p.m.
Victoria Park, 3 p.m.
Woolwich, Beresford Square, 7.30 p.m.
Hyde Park, 11.30 a.m.
Paddington, Prince of Wales, 11.30 a.m.
Mondays ... Camberwell, Wren Road, 7.30 p.m.
Wednesdays ... Clerkenwell, Garnault Place, 8 p.m.
Thursdays ... Forest Gate Station, 8 p.m.
Fridays ... Becontree, Rodney St. Ilford, 8 p.m.
Clerkenwell, Acton St., Grays Inn Rd. 8 p.m.
Hackney, Paragon Road and Mare Street, 8 p.m.
Saturdays ... Wood Green, Jolly Butchers Hill, 8 p.m.
Leyton, Corner Grange Park, 7.30 p.m.

HANLEY BRANCH.

- Sundays** ... Hanley Market Square, 7 p.m.
Burslem, St. John Square, 7 p.m.

GLASGOW.

- Mondays** ... Queens Park Gate, 7.15 p.m.
Tuesdays ... West Regent Street, 8 p.m.
Thursdays ... Raebury Street, Maryhill, 8 p.m.

BRANCH DIRECTORY.

- BATTERSEA.**—Sec., 2, Hanbury-road, S.W.11. Branch meets Thursday, 8.30 p.m. at The Waiting Room, Latchmere Baths, entrance in Burns-road. Discussion second Thurs. in month.
- BECONTREE.**—Sec., Hy. Gratton, 4, Drummond Ave., Brooklands, Romford. Branch meets 1st and 3rd Wednesdays at 7.30, at above address.
- BIRMINGHAM.**—Sec. E. Jesper, 38, Rollason-rd., Erdington. Branch meets The Continental Café, Moor St., 1st and 3rd Sundays at 11 a.m.
- CAMBERWELL.**—Branch meets at Camberwell Trades Council Room, 6A, Artichoke Place, Camberwell Green, every Friday at 8.30 p.m. Discussions—public invited. Letters to Secretary at above address.
- CENTRAL.**—Membership obtained only through the Ex. Committee. Applications to General Sec.
- CLERKENWELL.**—Branch meets Wednesdays, 8 p.m., at Emily Davison Club Rooms, 144, High Holborn (corner of Bury Street). Discussion after Branch business—all invited. Sec., at above address.
- EAST LONDON.**—Sec. W. E. McHaffie. Communications to Secretary, S.P.G.B., c/o 141 Bow Road. Branch meets every Friday at 8 p.m. at above address. Discussion after Branch business. Public invited.
- GLASGOW.**—W. Falconer, 128, Blue Vale, Street, Glasgow. Branch meets Friday, 8 p.m., at Herald League Book Stall, 39, Shuttle Street, Glasgow.
- HACKNEY.**—Branch meets Arcadian Cafe, 42, Amherst Road, Hackney, 1st and 3rd Mondays in month, 8 p.m., Discussions 9.30. Communication to Sec. as above.
- HANLEY.**—Branch meets Tuesdays, Working Men's Club, Glass-st.
- ISLINGTON.**—Branch meets Wednesdays, 8.30, at 144, Seven Sister-rd., Holloway, N. Sec., A. Gregory, 24, Goodinge Rd., N.7.
- LEYTON.**—Sec., 396, Lea Bridge-rd., Leyton. Branch meets 8 p.m., Trades and Labour Hall, Grove House, High-rd., second Mondays in month.
- MANCHESTER.**—Sec., W. Addison, 111, West Park-street, Salford, Manchester.—Branch meets 1st and 3rd Thursdays in month, 7.45 p.m.
- PADDINGTON.**—Branch meeting held on 2nd and 4th Fridays, 8 p.m., in room above the Co-operative Stores, 306, Kilburn-lane, W.9 (side door).
- SOUTHEND-ON-SEA.**—Sec., J. Bird, 5 Welling-ton-avenue, Westcliffe-on-Sea.
- TOOTING.**—Sec., E. Carnell, 110 Beechcroft Rd., S.W.17. Branch meets 2nd and 4th Fridays in the month. Discussion Circle 1st and 3rd Fridays, at 8 p.m., at Tooting Adult School, 971 Garratt Lane, S.W.17.
- TOTTENHAM.**—Secretary, 18, Woodlands Park Rd., N.15. Branch meets Fridays, Room 2, Trades Hall, 7, Bruce Grove. Discussion after branch business. Public invited.
- WALTHAMSTOW.**—Sec., S. E. Williams, 64, Bloxham-rd., Leyton, E.10. Branch meets at Workmen's Hall, High-st., every Monday.
- WATFORD.**—A. Lawson, Sec., 107 Kensington-avenue, Watford. Branch meets Mondays at 8.30 p.m. at Secretary's address.

WEST HAM.—Branch meets Thursdays at 8 p.m. at 167 Romford rd., Stratford. Sec., P. Hallard, 22, Colegrave-rd., Stratford, E.

WOOD GREEN.—All communications to Sec., F. W. Godfrey, 71, Falkland Road, N.8.

WOOLWICH.—Branch meets at 94, Griffin Road, Plumstead. Communications to Secretary at above address.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN.

OBJECT.—The establishment of a system of society based upon the common ownership and democratic control of the means and instruments for producing and distributing wealth by and in the interests of the whole community.

DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great HOLDS— Britain

That society as at present constituted is based upon the ownership of the means of living (i.e., land, factories, railways, etc.) by the capitalist or master class, and the consequent enslavement of the working class by whose labour alone wealth is produced.

That in society, therefore, there is an antagonism of interests, manifesting itself as a class struggle, between those who possess but do not produce and those who produce but do not possess.

That this antagonism can be abolished only by the emancipation of the working class from the domination of the master class, by the conversion into the common property of society of the means of production and distribution, and their democratic control by the whole people.

That as in the order of social evolution the working class is the last class to achieve its freedom, the emancipation of the working class will involve the emancipation of all mankind, without distinction of race or sex.

That this emancipation must be the work of the working class itself.

That as the machinery of government, including the armed forces of the nation, exists only to conserve the monopoly by the capitalist class of the wealth taken from the workers, the working class must organise consciously and politically for the conquest of the powers of government, national and local, in order that this machinery, including these forces, may be converted from an instrument of oppression into the agent of emancipation and the overthrow of privilege, aristocratic and plutocratic.

That as political parties are but the expression of class interests, and as the interest of the working class is diametrically opposed to the interests of all sections of the master class, the party seeking working-class emancipation must be hostile to every other party.

The SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain, therefore, enters the field of political action determined to wage war against all other political parties, whether alleged labour or avowedly capitalist, and calls upon the members of the working class of this country to muster under its banner to the end that a speedy termination may be wrought to the system which deprives them of the fruits of their labour, and that poverty may give place to comfort, privilege to equality, and slavery to freedom.

Those agreeing with the above principles and desiring enrolment in the Party should apply for membership form to secretary of nearest branch or at Head Office.

THE Socialist Standard

The Official Organ of **THE SOCIALIST PARTY** of Great Britain.

No. 302. Vol. 26.]

LONDON, OCTOBER, 1929

[MONTHLY, TWOPENCE]

POTASH AND PALESTINE. DEAD-SEA FRUIT.

The fighting between Arabs and Jews, which broke out in Palestine in the middle of August with heavy loss of life and the usual stories of "atrocities" on both sides, has drawn renewed attention to the Zionist Movement and to the whole question of racial and religious strife in the modern world.

The Zionist Movement was founded by a Jewish journalist, Theodor Herzl, who in 1895 was sent to Paris by a Vienna newspaper to report on the famous Dreyfus case. In his pamphlet, "The Jewish State," he argued that the relationship between Jews and non-Jews would never cease to be a problem until an independent Jewish national state had been set up, preferably in Palestine. His scheme was received at first with hostility or indifference, but from 1897, when the inaugural congress was held, the movement grew continually stronger and wealthier, being helped considerably by the gifts of Baron Edmond de Rothschild. There seemed to be little prospect of settlement on a large scale in Palestine, then part of the Turkish Empire, until the British Government, on the capture of Jerusalem, issued a declaration in 1917 committing themselves to the idea of establishing a Jewish national home in that country. Since 1919 the Jewish population has increased from 57,000 to 162,000, but they still represent a small minority in comparison with the 650,000 Arabs. The Christians number about 75,000.

It has been too readily assumed that the conflict is wholly or mainly due to racial or religious differences, a view which has been seemingly supported by the fact that the actual incident which precipitated the out-

burst was connected with the "Wailing Wall," a spot sacred to the adherents of the Jewish religion but the property of Moslems. It is not necessary to look far below the surface to see that this kind of explanation is inadequate. The differences exist, but while they add bitterness to the dispute they are not the underlying cause of it. For a thousand years until after the war Arabs and Jews lived side-by-side in Palestine without ill-will. The Jews in Baghdad have issued a manifesto condemning Zionism and associating the local Jews with the protests of the Moslems. (See report in *Times*, 31st, August.) Many Jews in Palestine are indifferent to the Jewish religion. It is interesting to notice, also, that whereas British and American Christians in Jerusalem helped to defend the Jews against the Arabs, the native Christians sided with the Moslems. The Arab Christians are reported to have expressed the opinion not long after the British Government's Zionist Declaration that they would prefer to be back under the Turks. (See *Morning Post*, September 13th.) Moreover, many Jews in Europe and America and elsewhere are still in complete hostility to the objects and principles of the Zionist Movement.

The British Prime Minister has stated his view that the conflict is not one of race or religion, but merely the outburst of disorderly persons—an explanation which again fails to explain. Then the Communists inform us, in a resolution passed at the last Congress of the League against Imperialism (one of the numerous aliases of the Communist International), that Zionism is one of the "instruments of Imperialism" for the "oppression of the Arab peoples." (See

Sunday Worker, September 1st.) They call on the British and Jewish workers "to stand side by side with the fight of the Arabs for independence." (*Sunday Worker*, September 8th.)

Let us now consider the chief interested parties and what exactly their interests in Palestine and Zionism are. And, first of all, let us consider the position of the British Government.

The story is that Mr. Lloyd George was led to support Zionism out of gratitude to Dr. Weizmann, who in addition to being the head of the Zionist organisation was the chemist who made good Britain's shortage of explosives during the war. But it is well to remember certain other facts. One is that Palestine occupies a commanding position in relation to the protection of the Suez Canal route to India and beyond. It is an essential link in the Imperial Airway to India, and there is talk of an oil pipeline from Persia to the Palestine coast. Haifa has been described as the finest naval harbour on the Mediterranean, and the only harbour except Malta in which the British fleet could anchor for its protection. In the House of Commons, on April 30th of this year (see *Hansard* of that date). Mr. Amery, Colonial Secretary, said that Haifa will become "one of the main ports of the Middle East." In short, it is obvious that the British ruling class have some very powerful "Reasons of State" for remaining in Palestine, whether their protégés, the Zionists, are in trouble with the Arabs or not.

Next, let us consider the Zionist movement. On July 28th of this year the 16th Congress of the Zionists opened at Zurich, and resulted in some very important changes in the constitution of the governing body. Hitherto the "Jewish Agency," the body which has officially represented the Jewish settlement in Palestine, has been entirely composed of Zionists. The 16th Congress marked the success of Dr. Weizmann's plan to create an "extended Agency" representing Jewish circles quite outside and indifferent to the old Zionist movement. The correspondent of the *New Statesman* (August 31st) says that the old movement was democratic in organisation and "represented chiefly the lower Jewish middle-class, which in Eastern Europe was even poorer than the proletariat." The new Agency is frankly non-democratic and "represents on the whole higher Jewish finance and big

business . . . the practical, hard-boiled American business man." At its first meeting on the 11th August there were present, among others, Sir Herbert Samuel and Lord Melchett (Mond). (See *Industrial and Labour Information*, Geneva, September 16th.) We may observe in passing that the correspondent of the *New Statesman* says that many of these hard-boiled business men are interested very much in the philanthropic side of the venture, and Mr. Amery, too, thought that the American interest was "no doubt largely sentimental." (*Hansard*, April 30th.) But, then, there are other things also. Lord Melchett and his business associates have interests in Palestine in connection with water power concessions for the production of electricity, but what is, at least potentially, of most importance to them, as chemical producers, is the concession for the extraction of potash and other valuable salts from the Dead Sea. At present a German cartel practically monopolises potash and its allied chemicals, and it is hoped by the Anglo-American interests who take this philanthropic interest in Palestine that the Dead Sea may make them independent of the German producers. Colonel Howard-Bury, M.P., has said (see *Hansard*, 30th November, 1927) that the potash deposits alone are estimated to be worth £14,000 million at current prices; although it is true that Mr. Amery (*Hansard*, 12th March, 1928) would not commit himself to this figure, and Sir Herbert Samuel has estimated it at a mere £800 million. Mr. Amery, has, however, stated that the Dead Sea is estimated to contain 2,000 million metric tons of potassium chloride and 980 million metric tons of magnesium chloride, and the financial interest behind the concessionaires believe that it can be profitably extracted. (*Hansard*, 12th March.) In the light of this information those words "philanthropic" and "sentimental" make us smile.

It is true that big business men, especially the hard-boiled ones, are notoriously sentimental, and they can afford to be philanthropic; but we too could afford to be philanthropic and sentimental if we were in their shoes, more especially if there was a chance that the philanthropic sprat might hook a Dead Sea mackerel worth £800 million.

In face of this it is not surprising that Mr. Felix M. Warburg, the American Chairman of the new Jewish Agency, should be very angry with the British authorities for

having allowed his fellow Jews to organise provocative demonstrations at the Wailing Wall, and thus disturb the "prosperity" of Palestine. (See *Times*, 6th September.) Riots are bad for business as well as being a source of grief for the hard-boiled but tender-hearted captains of industry.

And what of the Arabs, on whose behalf the simple Communists want British and Jewish workers to fight for independence? Arab workers have been incited against Jewish immigrant landowners, but forget that Arab property owners sold them the land. The Mufti, in an interview with the Palestine High Commissioner on September 6th (see *Daily Telegraph*, September 7th), demanded:

on behalf of the Arab community equal economic rights with the Jews, the abrogation of Jewish monopolies for hydro-electric and other concessions, and the regranting of all concessions by and through a Federal Government on the basis of open competition.

Translated into actual facts, this means that the wealthy Arabs resent seeing all the loot pocketed by their Jewish rivals. Many of these Arabs made vast sums of money out of land speculations owing to the rise in prices following the increased demand for land on the part of the Jews. But what is the value to the property-less Arab worker of the "right" to tender in "open competition" for Dead Sea concessions? It is worth precisely the same as the British worker's "right" to become a shareholder in Melchett's Chemical Combine, or the existing concession companies—nothing whatever. The whole struggle is one between rival Jewish, Arab, American and British capitalists for the valuable privilege of exploiting Jew and Arab, Christian and Atheist, and any other kind of worker. Jewish as well as Arab working-class organisations are suppressed in the employers' interest. Religion and race, national independence and patriotism, are now, from the worker's point of view, just so many ruling-class devices useful for the purpose, among others, of stirring up hatred when and where they may want it. Arabs and Jews in Palestine and Iraq have no more interest at stake in the independence of the states in which, and by which, their exploitation is carried on, than had British and German workers in 1914. Socialism alone is worth struggling for. That is the message of the Socialist to all the working-class dupes of the closely-allied superstitions of religious, racial and patriotic rivalries. Jewish workers and Arab workers both

suffer, but not because they are Jew or Arab, or because they happen both to be in Palestine, but because they are workers and therefore exploited by those who own and control their means of life. The Jewish workers cannot solve their problems by transferring their misery from New York or Berlin to Jerusalem. The world will be fit for Jewish workers and Arab workers to live in when, and only when, the working-class, as a whole, have gained political control for the establishment of Socialism.

H.

BIRTH CONTROL WAGES AND PRIVATE PROPERTY.

THE ATTITUDE OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

Birth-prevention is a dodge of the rich man against the poor. The only defence of the poor lies in their numbers. The rich are afraid, hence some of them, with devilish ingenuity, advocate birth-prevention to rob the poor of his only strength. It was loudly proclaimed in the Rotary Club at Leicester that if the poor will practise birth-control they will be content with smaller houses and lower wages. The poor, gullible crowd, is walking into the trap set for them by a few cunning fellows. It is always awkward to have to use machine-guns on the mob; teach them birth-control. It is just as effective. It does not soil your hands; in fact, you will be hailed as a benefactor by the poor dupes.

* * *

I am asked what nature orders a starving and penniless man to do when passing a baker's shop. I answer: To take as much bread as will fully satiate his hunger. The Catholic Church teaches that nature abolishes all private ownership in the extreme and immediate need of one's neighbour.

(The above extracts are taken from a letter written to the *Daily News*, September 5th, by Dr. J. P. Arendzen, M.A., D.D., D.Ph., a noted Roman Catholic writer.)

EAST LONDON.

LECTURES

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 4th.

"The Labour Theory of Value"
Speaker: A. GOLDBERG.

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 18th.

"Communist Party Confusion"
Speaker: H. WAITE.

Public Invited. Admission Free.
Questions and Discussion Commence at 7.45 p.m.

ANOTHER LIFE OF MARX. GUESSES AT TRUTH.

("Karl Marx," by Otto Ruhle. Translated by Eden & Cedar Paul. Allen & Unwin, 15s.)

This book has been written with a heavy hand. It is a curious mixture of contradictions, bitterness, excellent quotations and "modern" psychology. When a man gets on his hobby horse he is apt to leave the world of reality and ride off into the realm of dreams. The author of this book has a hobby horse and when he gets astride of it his dreams are ugly ones. Such was my view when half-way through the book, but as I read on I began to get suspicious. The blacks in the picture were put in a little too thickly and too often. The last two pages supplied the key, and I have come to the conclusion that the book was written for its last two pages and is, in fact, an apology and an excuse for the actions of German Social Democracy. However, I will deal with this last point later.

Now there are already a number of Lives and Monographs of Marx in existence, including Liebnicht's, Spargo's (the photos in which are practically identical with those in this book), Beer's, Ryazanoff's and others. Why then this new one, which, apart from mud spattering and some new quotations, adds nothing to what has already been done?

On page 371 the author sets out his psychological views upon the subject of his biography in the following terms:

If we translate into psychological terms these principles of the method of historical materialism, we get the following. Man forms his character out of his organic constitution and his social and family position. The biological and social interests that promote his safeguarding find expression (unconsciously) in aims. The main trend of his behaviour arises with reference to these aims. Opinions, conceptions, ideas, manifest themselves as forms of expression of the individual's aim to safeguard his own existence. Decisive for each of us in the formation of character and in the development of trend of behaviour is, in the individualistic epoch, the urge to self-expression as an individuality, an urge dictated by the circumstances of life.

When, in the light of these guiding principles, we contemplate the man Marx—contemplate him solely as a man, apart from his work—our attention is riveted by three characteristics:—

First, his persistent ill-health, from which we infer that there was constitutional weakness or organic defect.

Secondly, his Jewish origin, which he felt as a social stigma.

Thirdly, his position as a first-born child.

The author then proceeds to elaborate his theory, the essence of which is that Marx

suffered severely from an "inferiority complex" arising primarily from a bad constitution, and this was the motive that urged him to outstrip everybody and abhor a rival "near the throne." The "scientific" nature of the author's analysis of Marx may be gathered from the following further quotation (page 376):

If, in the light of these considerations, we turn to examine the personality of Marx, we see the before-mentioned biological, social and family traits in a new and instructive light. But the traits in question are only the elements, the first crude constituents, of a psychological analysis—with which we have to content ourselves, since we lack more detailed materials as regards the life of Marx. Obviously, they do not suffice for an exhaustive analysis. Many of the gaps in our observation will have to be filled in artificially; a schematic construction will have to supplement the defects of observation. Nevertheless, we can get a great deal further than was possible by earlier psychological methods. Even if we do not achieve definitive knowledge, in this respect psychological analysis is no more inadequate than the other sciences, for science has to leave many ultimate problems open.

What all this amounts to, then, is that his view of Marx is guess-work; there are gaps, but these are filled up by assumptions! But if psychological science has not progressed far enough for an accurate analysis, why guess now? What was the urgency of the matter in this special case—particularly as the enemies of the Socialist movement are at their wits end for weapons with which to hinder our progress? And if so much of it is guess-work, why the particular bitterness of the diatribes against Marx by the author? The following are specimens of the author's estimate of Marx. I have numbered each quotation for convenience in dealing with them:

(1) He (Grun) had wrongfully accused Marx of not protesting with sufficient vigour against expulsion from France, and Marx, who was always too ready to take offence, had therefore conceived an animus against Grun which formed the undertone of a fierce criticism of the latter's attitude towards the problems of Socialism. (p. 98.)

(2) One day, when Marx insisted upon the rejection of fanciful and over-enthusiastic schemes for universal happiness (passing by the name of Communism), Weitling advocated the cause of the Utopists, the dispute leading to an open breach between him and Marx. Since the latter had an unhappy talent for introducing personal animus into theoretical disputes, the relations between the two men were poisoned henceforward, and they became irreconcilable enemies. (p. 123.)

(3) There is no use blaming a man for his character. All we are to infer from these descriptions is that Marx, despite his thirty years, his extensive achievements and his reputation as a man of learning and a politician, was still

what he had been in youth, one fighting to secure recognition, one doubtful as to his prestige. His arrogance, his self-conceit, his dogmatism and disputatiousness and irritability, must reveal themselves to everyone who understands human nature as masks for a lack of self-confidence, under stress of which he was perpetually trying to avert the danger of exposure. He could not listen quietly to an opponent, because he was afraid that his opponent might get the better of him if allowed to continue. He had to shout down every hostile opinion because he was haunted by spectral doubts lest this opinion should gain adherents and leave him unsupported. He tried to discredit his adversaries because he hoped that personal onslaughts would shake the validity of opposing arguments. He could not tolerate rivals because he was perpetually tortured with the dread lest it should become apparent in one way or another that not he, but his rival, was the ablest of the able, the most efficient of the efficient, the most revolutionary of the revolutionists.

This domineering behaviour was animated by the unconscious conviction that he would be able to overawe the timid among his opponents. When he made fun of the opinions of others, he was trying to fortify the sense of his own superiority. When he crowned himself with anticipatory laurels, he did so in the belief that this would ensure his triumph, and entitle him to wear the laurel crown.

Only one person would Marx allow to express opinions—Engels. The sole reason for his tolerance in this quarter was that he could rely on being able to use Engels' remarkable talents for his own purposes as dictator, without Engels expecting any return or thanks, or grant of equality. As long as a collaborator was a willing servant, he could work on the best of terms with Marx. But when this collaborator expressed an opinion of his own, or claimed to assert his own will against that of Marx, the fat was in the fire. Marx was a typical authoritarian. (p. 158.)

I will forbear quoting more, but there are numerous similar examples through the book. Now for a few remarks on the above.

(1) No evidence is given that Marx had "conceived an animus against Grun." Surely an historian who claims to be scientific should at least give evidence for his charges? The justification for Marx's "fierce criticism" is provided by Ruhle himself. On the same page he gives the following description of Grun:

Among the "true Socialists," perhaps the most notable was Karl Grun, a Westphalian. He had been one of Marx's fellow students, and Moses Hess had made him acquainted with Engels. His socialist career had started from the radical "small-beer Liberalism." Then he had coquetted with Fourierism for a time, until at length, having got into touch with Hess, he deviated towards early Socialism. All possible varieties of Socialism were jumbled together in his head. Out of borrowed and undigested thoughts from Proudhon, Feuerbach, Hess and Marx, he had brewed the most amazing elixir

of happiness, whose formulas were aesthetically tinted and were couched in a feuilleton style. From Paris, writing hastily and irresponsibly, he sent his lucubrations to the German Press, and especially to the "Triersche Zeitung."

(2) Weitlung, another of those towards whom Marx is accused of having a personal animus, is described by Ruhle as follows:

. . . . when Weitling turned up in Brussels, and joined the Workers' Educational Society there, it became apparent that his development had proceeded no further, and that he had become infected with inordinate vanity, with an undue sense of superiority. He was continually talking about utopias and conspiracies, and imagined himself a prey to the persecution of envious rivals. (p. 122.)

Seemingly a very easy man to fall out with! But perhaps he also had the stomach-ache!

(3) This paragraph by the author is immediately based on the statement of Carl Schurz relating to a meeting he attended when he was 19. Schurz had hardly reached an age to give a dependable judgment. Besides, in harmony with the author's theory, would it not be necessary to know all about Schurz and the other opponents of Marx to be able to decide whether their judgments were also vitiated by an "inferiority complex." In fact, according to this delightful theory, it would appear that one really "knows nothing about nothing," but just goes on guessing!

The paragraph is also similar in essentials to Bakunin's description of Marx, the value of which may be gauged from the following:—

Bakunin honestly endeavoured to be on good terms with Marx [How does Ruhle know?] and to avoid friction. But he could not entertain cordial sentiments for Marx. The two men differed too much in mental structure, in theoretical trend, and in fundamental attitudes towards the revolutionary problem, for this to be possible. Bakunin loved the peasants; detested intellectualism and abstract systems with their dogmatism and intolerance; hated the modern State, industrialism and centralisation; had the most intense dislike for Judaism and all its ways, which he regarded as irritable, loquacious, unduly critical, intriguing, and exploitative. Everything for which he had an instinctive abhorrence, everything which aroused in him spiritual repugnance and antagonism, was for him incorporated in Marx. (p. 280.)

Evidently another very difficult man not to fall out with! But the strangeness of it! In face of the above, Ruhle yet drags in Bakunin as a witness for the prosecution!

At the period Marx was carrying on his work the working-class movement was youthful; it was honeycombed with emis-

saries of the various governments, whose mission it was to undermine and destroy the movement. Men of all kinds of opinion found their way in and tried to impose their schemes upon the rest. Political job hunters endeavoured to use the movement as means to personal aggrandisement, and Governments were ever ready to buy off dangerous opposition with either money or flattery. Marx plunged into this welter of ignorance, chicanery and egotism and endeavoured to build-up a movement on sound principles with a clear understanding of the necessities of the time. He met with bitter opposition from the earnest as well as from the treacherous. Always surrounded by intrigue, was it any wonder that he was suspicious and occasionally lost patience? Particularly as his suspicions were proved in so many cases to have been well-founded.

It is quite easy for Mr. Ruhle, in these comparatively comfortable times in Germany, to sit back in his chair and see in Marx's bitterness only the results of stomach-ache, but surely the accumulations of surrounding treachery and pettiness can play upon the strongest nerves until they eventually produce irritability without such irritability having its original source in a feeling of inferiority!

Ruhle complains of Marx's attitude towards Bakunin and Lassalle. Surely anyone familiar with their actions must agree that, apart from political and economical unsoundness, they lent themselves to suspicion: Bakunin by his underground tactics and Lassalle by his showy methods. The historian of the present has written information in front of him that was not in the hands of those fighting at the time, and if there is to be praising or blaming then it should be accorded with this in mind—unless the author has the stomach-ache!

That Marx had adequate reason for his bitter hostility to Bakunin is surely borne out by the following quotation, when it is remembered that Ruhle is at much pains to show that Bakunin was professing friendship for Marx during that time:

At the Berne Congress of the League of Peace and Freedom, Bakunin had tried to induce the League to adopt a revolutionary programme, and to affiliate to the International. When this attempt failed, he resigned from the League, and in conjunction with J. P. Becker, founded the International Alliance of the Socialist Democracy, also known as the Alliance of Social Revolutionaries. His aim now was to get this Alliance accepted as part of the International; then, by degrees, to excavate and absorb the International

until, at last, the International would be replaced by the Alliance. (p. 283.)

A very pretty plan! He aimed at quietly smashing up the International, and yet Ruhle cavils at Marx for his bitterness! Mr. Ruhle is really too well-mannered a gentleman altogether.

(To be continued.)

GILMAC.

CURRENCY REFORM AND SOCIALISM.

E. Wright (Denmark Park) writes further on the subject of Money Reform. In an earlier letter (see August "S.S.") this correspondent told us that we ought to take up the question because money reform would enable us "to do wonders in starting State-owned industries." We replied that our correspondent had omitted to explain what advantage to the working-class State-ownership would bring, and what it has to do with Socialism. In the further letter our correspondent says, "State-owned industries might lead to Socialism." We deny that there is any "might" about it. State-ownership is not Socialism and does not lead to Socialism. It still remains for our correspondent to give his reasons for believing that State capitalism would benefit the workers or lead to Socialism.

ED. COMM.

A QUEER PARTY.

Mr. David Kirkwood, M.P., writes a letter to the *Daily Herald* (19th September) giving a corrected version of a speech he made on his party—the I.L.P.

These are his words:—

The time was not far away when they would have to decide whether their aims could be realised within Capitalism or not. He did not believe that they could. If they could be realised under Capitalism, then there was no use for an I.L.P.

One can only gasp in amazement at the spectacle of an alleged Socialist organisation which, after existing for 36 years, has not yet found the time opportune to consider whether its aims could be realised within capitalism or not. We implore Mr. Kirkwood to tell us how far away the time for decision is.

 Send your TINFOIL to the General Secretary at the Head Office—It will help to Raise Funds.

WOMEN IN INDUSTRY.

Is it "right" or "fair" that women should continue to hold those positions in industry that formerly were held by men?

Mr. Charles Pilley's article in the *Sunday Graphic* of August 25th tells us that it is neither.

His first paragraph sounded rather promising. He said, "We are groping for remedies without a true understanding of the nature of the disease." His last shows us poor Mr. Pilley still hopelessly groping. It is as follows: "It would be instructive if we could learn how many women are working at jobs which once belonged to men at wages below a decent minimum, thus unfairly competing with male rivals and cheapening the worth of labour to the detriment of all."

We take it, of course, that Mr. Pilley really means the price of labour power.

Directly labour power has been expended by the worker the labour is embodied in the product and as such can be of no further concern to him. It has become the property of the master who bought the labour power. Thus a worker can sell his labour power for a specified time, but not his labour, for it is not his to sell.

It should not be difficult for Mr. Pilley to get the figures of women in men's jobs (although, as women can perform the work, I do not see the point for calling them men's jobs), but when he has them, what does he suggest doing about it? His article does not say anything on the matter, so we must presume that he has not thought so far ahead as that. But let us view this question in the light of the Socialist knowledge. The war forced many young women into industry probably very many years sooner than normally would have been the case.

At the same time the introduction of labour-saving machinery so lightened some kinds of physical labour that men were not required to perform many of the tasks on which they were previously employed. Added to this, women's labour power can often be bought more cheaply by the masters, because of the fact that the future supply of labour power comes into men's responsibilities. The man's wages include the upkeep of a wife, a home and a family. A woman's is the price of her own maintenance, in the main. Again the woman is a more tractable worker. More easily frightened by threats of the sack and less

easily organised in trade unions. In some cases her work is better, especially where cleanliness, neatness and dexterity are required.

Then, the fact that so many women leave after a few years' service, to get married, obviates the necessity of a pension. These are the things which count when the pros and cons are weighed up by the employers. Where women are as competent and the advantages outweigh the disadvantages the employers will take them in preference to men.

It is of no use men kicking against these facts and blaming women for it. They must realise that as the capitalist system becomes more and more developed, these and greater hardships will be suffered by the working-class in their struggle for existence. In their endeavours to obtain more profit the masters will exploit the labour power of the workers, men and women, by every conceivable method. But they, as well as the workers, are in a vicious circle. Trade depression becomes more pressing and continuous, and it is only the lack of understanding on the part of the workers that keeps capitalism going on. International agreements, doles and charities are some of the methods by which the capitalist class try to alleviate the worst of the workers' troubles, but on the day that the workers are ready to vote solid for Socialism the game is up. It only remains, therefore, for the workers to look beneath the surface of all their troubles to find that the remedy for each and every one of them is Socialism. Armed with the necessary knowledge, they are all-powerful and the capitalists know it, and that is why their paid hirelings disseminate so much confusion on the subject.

MRS. O.

CLASSES AT HEAD OFFICE.

The following classes at Head Office will commence in the first week of October.

MONDAYS

"INDUSTRIAL HISTORY"

Instructor, G. McCLATCHIE.

WEDNESDAYS

"ECONOMICS"

Instructor, A. BEALES.

THURSDAYS

SPEAKER'S CLASS

Instructor, E. HARDY.

Commence 8 p.m.

Admission Free.

OFFICIAL NOTICE.

All communications for the Executive Committee, Subscriptions for the *SOCIALIST STANDARD*, Articles, and Correspondence submitted for insertion therein, should be addressed—The Socialist Party of Great Britain, 42, Great Dover Street, London, S.E.1, to whom Money Orders should be made payable.

The meetings of the Executive Committee are held at the Head Office, every Tuesday, at 7.30 p.m.

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTIONS.

Twelve Months, post free.. .. 2s. 6d.
Six Months, post free 1s. 3d.

The Socialist Standard.

OCTOBER,



1929

THE COMMUNIST FARCE.

At the moment of going to press we find a notice in the *Daily Herald* (20th September) to the effect that there is a split in the Communist Party and that Pollitt, Campbell and Horner are denounced as "Right wingers."

We are not yet in a position to state how far the report is true, but the situation again calls attention to the fundamental unsoundness of the main plank in the policy of the Communist Party, both here and abroad. That plank is "Trust in leaders."

The movement of the Communist Party, abroad as well as at home, during the last eleven years has been like the movement of a film from "Right" to "Left" with new stars in every period, or like the childish game of "who would be king of the castle."

For a time each group of stars has occupied the stage, denouncing their fore-runners as "Right" wingers and pushing them out. The last leaders, in their turn, then become the subject of denunciation as "Right" wingers. Each fallen star is depicted in the blackest of colours, although he is in fact no different in mental attitude from his attitude in the starring period.

The attitude and methods of the Communist Party lend themselves to the job-

hunting and wire-pulling methods of a type that has always been common in the working-class movement. And it was partly for this reason that Karl Marx and his associates insisted so strongly upon the fact that "the emancipation of the working class must be the work of the working class itself."

It is also well to remember that while the energies of earnest and active working men are thus brought to nothing by the wranglings among the kings of the castle, the capitalists can look on and smile, secure in the knowledge that an army torn with dissension can never be successful in battle.

Let the working class give up this slavish and sheep-like acceptance of leaders and themselves set about solving the social problem. The problem and the solution are comparatively simple, but they cannot be wafted away by phrases or slogans. The budding leader can always be recognised by his predilection for such things. Phrases and slogans have always been the stock-in-trade of the men who have striven to rise on the crest of waves of popularity to positions either of economic security or positions that flatter the vanity of the lover of power for its own sake.

The society we aim at building in the future is one wherein all will have a free and equal hand in the ordering of affairs. How can such a society be built on foundations such as the blind worship of the leaders of a day?

We repeat, therefore, again the lesson we have been repeating monotonously for the last twenty-five years: No leader, however honest, clever or well-intentioned can lead the workers out of slavery. No man or group of men, however intellectual, can found a new society which depends for its success upon the knowledge and understanding of the bulk of the population. There is no royal road to Socialism. It can only be attained by working men and women who know what Socialism means and how it is to be obtained. Therefore, it is necessary for working men and women to do the comparatively small amount of thinking that is necessary to understand Socialism. When they have done so they will know the steps to be taken, and will no longer need to rely on the weak reed of leadership. In that day the utterer of cheap, choice and false phrases will find eloquence wasted and will be forced to go and find some useful occupation.

THE 61st TRADES UNION CONGRESS.**BEN TILLET'S DAY OUT.**

The 1929 Annual Congress of the T.U.C. was held this year at Belfast under the chairmanship of Mr. Ben Tillett, M.P.

What decided the choice of Belfast, we do not know. That Belfast is far enough away to preclude the embarrassing presence of embittered workers from the mining and cotton districts is fairly certain. Windy platitudes, therefore, had free play.

Mr. Tillett's presidential address was received by the Press with more than the usual flattery that is doled out to the trade union and Labour leader.

Says the *Daily Herald*: "He acquitted himself in a manner which has given the keynote to the Congress—that of business efficiency tempered with humanity." Mr. Tillett's form—on the one occasion when the present writer heard him, corresponded more closely to Billy Sunday revivalism, tempered with acrobatics. But different audiences call for different turns—as variety artists know.

Mr. Tillett, pre-war firebrand, war-time jingo, and recent communist pet, delivered a flamboyant speech, whose main argument was a characteristic piece of nonsense. He declared "with an air of triumph" that "To-day the trade unions are an integral part of the organisation of industry" (*Daily Herald* report, September 3rd).

They negotiated as equals, and did not deal only with hours, wages and conditions, but with policy and economic organisation in the widest aspects. . . . They hold an unchallenged position as representatives of the working class in all negotiations affecting conditions of employment. . . . There is nothing in the organisation and direction that can now be regarded as the exclusive concern of the employer.

What comforting news to miners and cotton-workers in the desolate poverty-stricken villages of Northumberland, Lanarkshire and Manchester. It might, of course, strike them as curious that there are ever industrial disputes at all. And, more curious still, that disputes of recent years have led to an encroachment on their already low standard of living.

If Mr. Tillett meant that many employers have now learned that it is an advantage to them to deal with an organised body of workers, and that they sometimes negotiate with trade union officials about adjustments of wages, conditions and hours, his state-

ment is not untrue; but why the "air of triumph"?

What cause is there to be triumphant because the cotton masters consulted cotton trade union officials and allowed other trade union leaders to negotiate the recent wage reduction?

If Mr. Tillett's words were intended to mean what they say, then they were just bluff. The trade unions are not to-day, and never have been, an "integral part" of the organisation of industry. They do not, and never have, been able to negotiate "as equals"; nor do they deal "with policy and economic organisation in the widest aspects." The trade unions do not do any of these things because they have not the power. They neither own nor control the machinery of production and distribution, and those who own and control have no need and no intention of relinquishing their ownership or their control or the power over policy which accompanies ownership and control.

Turning to rationalisation, Mr. Tillett said:—

They had already given official support to the rationalisation of industry provided adequate safeguards were given to the workers. . . . rationalisation meant the most complete application of science and scientific organisation to industry—in plant, processes and production.

Rationalisation is a new name for a process as old as capitalism. Improvements in machinery are introduced by the capitalists for the benefit of capitalists. They are the outcome of competition between sections of the capitalist class, and can only have the effect of reducing the human labour required in production. The less labour-power required for the production of a given quantity of wealth—the more profits there are for the capitalist. This process is, and always has been, a feature of Capitalism. To-day the only difference is, that the pace has become quicker, and the trusts and combines more powerful. The smaller capitalists are vanishing; the position of the working class grows more insecure; and their relative portion of the wealth produced becomes less and less.

Mr. Tillett went on to say of rationalisation that, "It was their duty to see that the results of the tendency were beneficial to the workers." But he omitted to explain how this is to be done. The rationalisation of their industrial organisation is dictated by the employers in their own interest. The trade unions have not the

power to stop it (Mr. Tillett himself described it as "inevitable") and they have not the power to impose conditions on the employers. Point was given to this by the admission of Congress that is impotent to save the musicians from the unemployment and other effects of the introduction of sound films. The unions have not succeeded, and cannot succeed, in making it a condition of rationalisation that it shall take place only if the results are "beneficial to the workers." Trade unions can perform a useful and necessary service to the workers under Capitalism, but—not being the owners and controllers of industry—they cannot control industrial development; and when Mr. Tillett states that they can, he is doing a definite disservice to those whose interests he is paid to represent.

Mr. Tillett's further contribution to our knowledge was a boost of Empire trade and Empire development "in the interests of the workers," and in imitation of the U.S.A. In answer to this dangerous doctrine that working class interests may be promoted by the development of capitalist industry and trade, whether in Great Britain, Europe, the Empire or in any other geographical unit, it is only necessary to consider the U.S.A., which, for the moment, is the object of Mr. Tillett's admiration. In the U.S.A. every feature of capitalism as we know it here, is faithfully reproduced—with some aggravations. Inequality of wealth is even more striking than here, unemployment is no less—some estimates place it higher; insecurity there is as great, pauperism, overcrowded slums, the brutal crushing of strikes, and, last but not the less harmful, Yankee Ben Tillett—all these features of triumphant capitalism exist in their profusion over the water.

At the same time, it is wonderful how ideas catch on. Sidney Webb dines with the King, Snowden stays with the King, Macdonald visits the King to say good-bye when he goes abroad—and, not to be behind, Tillett does his bit and becomes "Imperial." Of course, Tillett has drunk much that inspires since the celebrated Devonport Farce on Tower Hill years ago.

INDUSTRIAL UNIONISM

Congress rejected a resolution, moved by Mr. A. J. Cook, asking the General Committee to try to promote organisation on the basis of "one union for each industry."

Mr. Ernest Bevin, on behalf of the Trans-

port and General Workers' Union, opposed the resolution, and pointed out that it would mean breaking up his organisation into 180 separate unions. He instanced the difficulty even of defining an industry in the face of continued capitalist combinations, in which financial control extended over all kinds of processes. He stated that "one of the associated companies of the Imperial Chemical Industries controlled 78 distinct processes" (*Daily Herald*, September 4th).

THE DAILY HERALD.

On Wednesday, September 4th, it was announced in the *Daily Herald* that the T.U.C. in private session had agreed, by 3,404,000 votes to 47,000 to make certain new arrangements for the development of the paper. Other newspapers announced that the new arrangement contemplated the handing over the *Daily Herald* to a private company, with, however, explicit guarantees that policy will remain under the control of the T.U.C.

WORKERS BANKS.

A Fraternal Delegate from the American Federation of Labour did his best to out-shine Mr. Tillett's home-produced nonsense by advocating "workers' banks." He described experiments in this direction which have been made in the U.S.A., and expressed the opinion that if all workers patronised their own banks "a chill would be sent along the spinal columns of the financial captains."

How perfectly simple! How is it that nobody has thought of it before! So easy, fellow workers; just put your surplus wealth in *your own* banks and show Rothschild and Sassoon what you are made of. What puerile inanities. It is difficult to believe that such piffle comes from paid representatives of the workers. The working class receive as the price of their labour power just that which will purchase the barest necessities in the form of food, clothing, and shelter. They simply cannot save enough to matter. The capitalist class appropriate the enormous remainder.

Then he gave the answer to his own hot-air by informing Congress (*Daily Herald*, September 5th) that in U.S.A. they are faced with the "difficulty of keeping men of 50 and over employed . . . particularly where labour-saving machinery had been introduced."

It looks very much as if U.S.A. workers

of 50 and over are not likely to have any savings or anything else, and those under 50 will be busy enough, when they are in work, trying to provide for their over-fifty relatives.

THE COTTON ARBITRATION.

Attacks were made on Mr. C. T. Cramp and Mr. A. G. Walkden for their part in the arbitration, which resulted in a 6½ per cent. reduction in wages for cotton operatives. They made the extraordinary defence (see *Daily Herald*, September 6th) that they "did not believe, and had never believed, that any wage cut would improve the cotton trade," but that the terms of arbitration gave full power to the Chairman, alone if necessary, to "give the award both on the principle and the amount of reduction."

This is, of course, no defence at all, even taken in conjunction with their further plea that if they had not agreed to a 6½ per cent. reduction, the "cut would have been double." Since this term of the arbitration was not known to the operatives, but was known to Mr. Cramp and Mr. Walkden, they could either have refused appointment to the Board or have insisted on the operatives making their own decision. It is at least probable that the latter would have rejected arbitration on such terms.

How does this square with the Chairman of Conference's speech?

THE TURNER-MOND CONFERENCES.

A resolution calling for the discontinuance of the Industrial Peace negotiations between the General Council and the T.U.C. was rejected by a large majority. Peace! for whom?—robber and robbed? Are the workers to abandon the only industrial weapon they possess, and leave themselves open to the systematic attacks of their masters? What else can peace mean? To babble of peace whilst the cotton dispute is still fresh in the memory and another attack on the miners is impending, is sheer hypocrisy. Peace—who asks for war anyway? The workers cannot afford to strike from pure frivolity. It is they who suffer during a strike, not their masters. It is they who see their children go hungry and without adequate clothing, who see their homes depleted and sold up.

The tone of the Congress was quiet and expectant—their friends now being the Government and A. J. Cook having dropped

the game of sniping at the General Council and coining silly slogans. But throughout the five days the cause of all the evils from which the workers suffer were not even glimpsed by the delegates. The cause is the private ownership in the means of life and the only solution is common ownership. Then those parasites who live by robbing the workers and exploiting their ignorance will disappear.

H. W.

MR. BELLOC AND THE SERVILE STATE.

Mr. Hilaire Belloc lectured recently on a favourite topic—the Servile State—at the Co-operative Summer School, held at the L.C.C. Day Training College. His address (delivered on Tuesday, August 27th) was reported in the *Co-operative News* on September 7th. After some very sound remarks on the dominance which belongs to the capitalist class through their ownership and control of the means of production and distribution, Mr. Belloc went on to air his views on Socialism. He said:—

Under Socialism all men were to be in the servile state. There were to be no free men ordering other men about, but the politicians were to do that instead.

When Mr. Belloc uses the word "Socialism," he possibly has in mind the administration of capitalism by Government experts, a theory beloved by the Fabians, who do the thinking for the Labour Party; but that is to give the word a meaning which robs it of sense and usefulness.

The existing subjection of the workers is due—as Mr. Belloc agrees—to the private ownership of the means of life.

How, then, can Socialism, i.e., social ownership, lead to the servile state? And how else than by social ownership can the evils of private or non-social ownership be eradicated? We are told that Mr. Belloc offers to enter into written controversy on the subject. We shall be pleased to offer him space in the *SOCIALIST STANDARD* to defend his extraordinary statements about Socialism.

NOTICE TO GLASGOW READERS.

The *SOCIALIST STANDARD* is on sale at the following Newsagents:

A. Doherty, (The Handy Stores) 6 Eglinton Street.
R. Black, 112 Paisley Road West.

ASPECTS OF THE "WOMEN QUESTIONS."

(Based on Notes of a series of lectures on "The Sexes in Evolution.")

(Continued.)

We are told there is a sex antagonism. Any morning we can open the pages of the stunt press and find articles calling attention to the intensity of the sex war. In the old days of the Women's Suffrage agitation the success of the movement depended upon women's adherence to, and recognition of, this sex war. As a matter of fact there is no sex antagonism and hasn't been for thousands of years. How many books have been written explaining the sex problem? Yet—there isn't a sex problem. There is a problem, but it is a *social* problem. And that problem is the problem of getting a decent living. Hunger and Love are the two dominating factors of life. They are the basic biological principles which underlie every form of living activity and every institution. The satisfaction of these two primal necessities is the first concern of all living things. But since we—different from most other animals—are obliged to co-operate with each other in order to obtain the food we require, the question becomes a social one. Further, since we find that the *means* of getting a living are in the possession of another class, the social question becomes a social problem, and, by the very nature of the existing structure of society, a political one as well. Incidentally, we know quite well that a problem is a problem no longer when its solution is known. We know the solution as readers of this journal will be well aware. For present purposes, however, we speak of the "social problem."

The so-called Women's Movement, so far as it has gone, has been a movement for the advancement of certain reforms within the framework of the present social system. It would be true to say that even if all their claims for equal political and social rights were achieved it would not mean the emancipation of women, or anything near it. Only those women would benefit who belong to the privileged, or propertied class in society—those with sufficient wealth to possess a political "pull." The majority of women, like the majority of men, belong to the wage-earning class, and this class cannot benefit so long as the tools of production—and not only the tools of production but

the product as well—remain the property of another class.

To those who see the effects only and do not trouble to trace causes, the women's struggle appears to be a struggle of sex against sex, and this idea is carefully worked upon. This mistake was made by the leaders themselves in the early feminist movement. They accepted the suggestion that woman was inferior to man, and in thousands of homes—especially those of working folk—it went without question.

That women are in a condition of subjection goes without saying. But they are not in subjection to the men. Individuals certainly may be, but not as a class. Men are in subjection—slaves to a system, and because the men are in subjection the women necessarily are in subjection, too. Morgan, in his valuable book, "Ancient Society," has shown that human society has an essentially economic basis. He has shown that the evolution of human society has progressed in accordance with the development of the means of production, and the methods of their ownership. Here we have the secret of the origin of all forms of social slavery, the subjection of women among the rest. Without the introduction of economic inequality, sex inequality could never have spread throughout the civilised world as it has done.

In the days of the adult suffrage agitation it was maintained that the acquisition of complete enfranchisement would mean sex equality. How true this claim was has now a chance of being shown. But right here it can be said that to make this claim is to lose sight of the true function of politics. Woman's subjection did not arise from political disabilities—in fact these disabilities themselves arose from woman's subjection—and, as already stated, this subjection has its roots deep down in economic inequality. Politics are the result of economic conditions, and in all its variety political action has gone upon the lines of economic interests. The enfranchisement of every man and every woman, now that it is practically universal, will certainly extend the possibilities of political action, but cannot of itself remove or alter the economic conditions under which people suffer. That is, so long as the majority of men and women remain *un-conscious* of their class position in society. So that universal suffrage, to be of value, depends upon the use to which it is put. Granting the vote to every man and

woman does not in the least jeopardise the position of the exploiting class at the present stage of working-class political education. We need only ask: who possessed the greatest social power—the woman employer who hadn't a vote, or the enfranchised wage-worker she exploited?

TOM SALA.

(To be continued.)

SOCIALISM AND REFORMS.

We print below a letter from a correspondent, together with our reply to his questions:—

Workers' Esperanto Club,
High Holborn, London,
August 21st, 1929.

To the Editor, SOCIALIST STANDARD.

Dear Sir,

Is the S.P.G.B. absolutely opposed to reforms under any conditions whatsoever?

For instance, in the cotton lock-out, the employers demanded a reduction in wages of 5/- to 6/- a week. What would the S.P.G.B. have advised the cotton workers to do? Should they have accepted the wage reduction without any demur or hesitation, because to struggle for 5/- or 6/- a week would have been struggling to maintain their *wage* position, or should they have refused, and having done so, should they have organised themselves by appointing lock-out committees, etc., for the struggle? Similarly, if in any other industry, a section of the working class were threatened with the same thing, what should they have done? Also, supposing the workers in any given industry are able by means of a strike, or threat of a strike, to obtain an increase in wages or shortening of hours, should they do so, since they would be fighting for a reform?

Does the attitude of the S.P.G.B. mean that the workers should wait until they are all fully conscious of the need for Socialism, neglecting in the meantime to struggle to maintain their position with regard to wages and hours, in so far as sections of the working class are continually having attacks made upon them by the capitalist class with respect to wages and hours?

Hoping you will see your way clear to explaining your attitude with regard to these questions.

Yours, etc., H. C.

REPLY.

Our correspondent's whole difficulty arises out of his mistake in thinking that a struggle against a wage reduction is the same thing as a policy of working for the political or social reform of capitalism.

We point out first that the working class are poor and a subject class because the capitalist class have political power and own and control the machinery of production and distribution. The cause of working

class poverty is not the existence of certain defects in the political machinery by which capitalism is administered. Therefore, no political reform (proportional representation, for example), and no social reform (old-age pensions, children's allowances, etc.), and no accumulation of such reforms will remedy the problem. If the whole of the reforms advocated by all the reform parties, from Conservative to Communist, were put on the Statute Book, the working class would still be a subject class and still poor. Therefore, the Socialist Party advocates Socialism, and seeks to organise the working class on a socialist basis.

We point out, further, that the only method of achieving socialism is for a socialist working class to gain political control. Anyone who urges the working class to put political power into the hands of persons and parties seeking election on a non-socialist programme, and therefore unable, even if willing, to use their power for any other purpose than the administration of capitalism, is acting directly contrary to the interests of the working class. All the reform parties have in this way acted contrary to working class interests, including the Communists, with their nationalisation projects and appeals to the workers to vote for MacDonald and other Labour candidates.

The development of capitalist industry constantly produces new social problems for the workers and aggravates old ones, and in the interests of the capitalists themselves these evils, which are merely the effects of capitalism, have to be palliated by various reform measures. The capitalists have to pass these reforms for two main reasons: loss of efficiency and loss of political support. If allowed to work unchecked, capitalism would produce such worsening in the conditions of the workers that they would, on the one hand, lose efficiency as profit-producers, and would perhaps, so the capitalist thinks, on the other hand, show their discontent with intolerable conditions by interesting themselves in Socialism or by riot and revolt which, though suicidal for the workers, would be troublesome and costly for the employing class. Incidentally, common sense suggests that the development of a strong socialist movement would cause the capitalist to fall over each other in their anxiety to make concessions in order to persuade the workers that socialism is un-

necessary and capitalism not so bad after all. In short, the Socialist Party opposes the parties which preach reform because there is no way of achieving socialism except through the making of socialists and their organisation into a political party which will gain political power for the purpose of introducing socialism.

The question of wage reductions is different in important respects. Reform parties, elected by non-socialist votes to administer capitalism, are blocking the way to socialism. Therefore we point this out and oppose them. But trade unions, the economic organisations of the workers, are chiefly concerned with the defence of the workers in their direct relations with the employers. They can, when market conditions are favourable, bring a certain organised pressure to bear on the employers to resist a decrease or secure an increase in wages. This is a definite, if limited, gain to the workers concerned. Therefore, we support the cotton workers or any other workers in their efforts in this direction, at the same time drawing their attention to the limits which capitalism imposes on all such activities. We point out in particular that every increase in wages or reduction in hours or curtailment of output gives the employers an added inducement to introduce more labour-saving machinery, thus increasing the number of unemployed and the consequent competition for jobs. We point out also that the workers should always keep the control of policy in their own hands and not give power to their leaders to negotiate in secret and settle on their own terms. But emphasising once more that no action of this kind, however well organised, can solve the real working class problem of abolishing capitalism, and, further, that the employing class always have it in their power to starve striking or locked-out workers into submission if they deem it worth while to do so. ED. COMM.

HACKNEY.

A SERIES OF LECTURES ON
"Evolution and its Relation to Socialism,"
will be given at
ARCADIAN CAFE, AMHURST ROAD,
every other Monday, at 8 p.m.
First Lecture October 7th.

Questions and Discussion.

Admission Free.

"NATIONALISATION IS OBSOLETE."

Mr. Walton Newbold makes a discovery.

Mr. J. T. Walton Newbold, M.A., who has been preaching nationalisation of the mines for nearly 20 years, has decided that it is now obsolete. He contributes to the *Miner* (August 17th) an article in which he argues that the grouping together of South Wales mining, iron and steel, wagon building, electrical and banking interests,

Makes obsolete the whole notion of nationalisation of the mines. Actually, that panacea of the propagandists of the last twenty years has been as dead as mutton for half a decade.

Although this is not by any means the first time Mr. Newbold has discovered his politics to be obsolete, and we shall not be surprised if, as on previous occasions, he shortly swallows his words, it is interesting to have this direct admission from one of the purveyors of obsolete remedies. It is still more interesting to hear why the secret has not been disclosed before. Addressing his remarks to the miners, he writes:—

Every Marxist has known that, though, I grant you, most of them have been too fearful of your disapproval to tell you the honest truth. Socialists are supposed to be guided by science. Actually, they are all too often swayed by the most sloppy sentimentality.

To that statement we would like to put in a protest and add a question. We deny that those who understood Socialism ever had any doubts on the question or ever believed nationalisation to be a panacea for working-class problems or deserving of any support whatever from the workers.

Newbold, the reformer, in his unstable passage through the Fabian Society, the Labour Party, the I.L.P., the Communist Party, the I.L.P. again, and finally the Social Democrat Federation, might have thought that nationalisation was a panacea; and Newbold, the carpet-bagger, when he learned differently may well have kept his thoughts to himself for fear of the disapproval of those whose votes and financial support he was seeking. Socialists never made the original error, nor had the need to be dishonest about their objects.

The question we would like Mr. Walton Newbold to answer is this:—

What are his reasons for believing that Nationalisation, before it became "obsolete" half a decade ago, would have proved a panacea for the workers?

It would appear that Mr. Newbold still finds it expedient not to risk the disapproval

of those who supply the funds and the votes. At the last election he fought as a Labour candidate, committed to support of the Labour Party and accepting its programme of nationalisation and its string of capitalist reforms. But although Labour Party rules definitely prevent Labour candidates from running as Socialists, we notice that when Mr. Newbold appealed for funds through a Canadian journal, his candidature suffered a strange transformation. In Epping he was a Labour Candidate seeking the non-Socialist votes of the Labour Party's supporters. In Winnipeg, he became a Socialist, and the votes he polled were "votes for Socialism." H.

"RED" VIENNA AND "RED" LONDON.

In recent years we have heard much talk of the wonders of Vienna under its Labour Council. It has been held up as a model of "Socialist" administration, although there is nothing in its record of municipal houses and baths, etc., which has anything whatever to do with Socialism. Vienna, to many members of the I.L.P. and the Labour Party, has been the equivalent of Moscow to the Communists: a sort of Mecca. Now Mr. Herbert Morrison, M.P., Minister of Transport and former Secretary of the London Labour Party, has been to Vienna, and comes back to tell us that capitalism in Vienna is just like our own brand. He says (*Daily Herald*, 10th September) "it would be misleading to say that Vienna is, in general ahead of English towns." There is one other little thing we learn from his visit to Vienna. That is that the Viennese Labourites are just as credulous and willing to believe tall stories as their British counterparts. To the I.L.P. Capitalist Vienna is "Red Vienna," and to the Viennese, London, it appears, is "Red London." In the *Arbeiter-Zeitung* (Vienna, 4th September), an article on the electoral successes of the London Labour Parties describes Mr. Morrison as "The man who has made London red."

We who, unfortunately, live in London and carry on the uphill work of trying to make Socialists did not know that Mr. Morrison had already done this for us. We did not even know that Mr. Morrison and his party were trying to. So also our Socialist friends in Vienna were completely

unaware that Vienna is "Socialist Vienna," and although Mr. Morrison now informs them of this fact they still refuse to be persuaded. It requires distance to lend enchantment to the view of capitalism when seen from the angle of the factory bench, the office desk, the working-class home, or the Labour Exchange. H.

A CORRECTION.

By an oversight the words "working class" were printed as "working-classes" on page 7, line 6, column 2, of the September "S.S." There is, of course, only one working class.

The correspondent who writes drawing our attention to this also points out that we allowed a contributor to write "God help the men" in the last paragraph of the article "Aspects of the Woman Question." The correspondent is afraid that we may be thought to have deserted Socialism for Christianity, and are advising the men to seek the aid of a non-existent deity. We assure him, with due solemnity, that the words were "writ sarcastic." We thank him for his zeal and commiserate with him on his apparent lack of a sense of humour.

ED. COMM.

"Socialism and Religion."

This unique Party Pamphlet is now reprinted at a price within the reach of all.

48 pages. TWOPENCE. 2½d. post free.

S.P.G.B. PROPAGANDA MEETINGS LONDON DISTRICT.

Sunday ... Canning Town, Beckton Road, 11.30 a.m.
Clapham Common, 3.30 p.m.
Tottenham, West Green Corner, 11.30 a.m.
Tooting, Garrett Lane, Tooting Broadway, 7.30 p.m.
Victoria Park, 11.30 a.m.
Mondays ... Paddington, Prince of Wales, 11.30 a.m.
Camberwell, Wren Road, 7.30 p.m.
Clerkenwell, Garnault Place, 8 p.m.
Wednesdays ... Forest Gate Station, 8 p.m.
Thursdays ... Becontree, Rodney St. Ilford, 8 p.m.
Fridays ... Clerkenwell, Acton St., Grays Inn Rd. 8 p.m.
Hackney, Paragon Road and Mare Street, 8 p.m.
Saturdays ... Wood Green, Jolly Butchers Hill, 8 p.m.
Leyton, Corner Grange Park, 7.30 p.m.

HANLEY BRANCH.

Sundays ... Hanley Market Square, 7 p.m.
Burslem, St. John Square, 7 p.m.

GLASGOW.

Sundays ... West Regent Street, 7.15 p.m.
Mondays ... Langside Avenue (Pollokshaws Road), 8 p.m.
Tuesdays ... West Regent Street, 8 p.m.
Thursdays ... Raeberry Street, Maryhill, 8 p.m.

BRANCH DIRECTORY.

BATTERSEA.—Sec., 2, Hanbury-road, S.W.11. Branch meets Thursday, 8.30 p.m. at The Waiting Room, Latchmere Baths, entrance in Burns-road. Discussion second Thurs. in month.

BECONTREE.—Sec., Hy. Gratton, 4, Drummond Ave., Brooklands, Romford. Branch meets 1st and 3rd Wednesdays at 7.30, at above address.

BIRMINGHAM.—Sec., E. Jesper, 32, Rollason-rd., Erdington. Branch meets The Continental Cafe, Moor St., 1st and 3rd Sundays at 11 a.m.

CAMBERWELL.—Branch meets at Camberwell Trades Council Room, 6A, Artichoke Place, Camberwell Green, every Friday at 8.30 p.m. Discussions—public invited. Letters to Secretary at above address.

CENTRAL.—Membership obtained only through the Ex. Committee. Applications to General Sec.

CLERKENWELL.—Branch meets Wednesdays, 8 p.m., at Emily Davison Club Rooms, 144, High Holborn (corner of Bury Street). Discussion after Branch business all invited. Sec., at above address.

EAST LONDON.—Sec. W. E. McHaffie. Communications to Secretary, S.P.G.B., c/o 141 Bow Road. Branch meets every Friday at 8 p.m. at above address. Discussion after Branch business. Public invited.

GLASGOW.—Branch meets Friday, 8 p.m., at Herald League Book Stall, 39, Shuttle Street, Glasgow. A. Shaw, 113, Henderson Street, Glasgow, C.1.

HACKNEY.—Branch meets Arcadian Cafe, 42, Amherst Road, Hackney, 1st and 3rd Mondays in month, 8 p.m., Discussions 9.30. Communicat on to Sec. as above.

HANLEY.—Branch meets Tuesdays, Working Men's Club, Glass-st.

ISLINGTON.—Branch meets Wednesdays, 8.30, at 144, Seven Sisters-rd., Holloway, N. Sec., A. Baker, 18, Orpingley Road, N.7.

LEYTON.—Sec., 396, Lea Bridge-rd., Leyton. Branch meets 8 p.m., Trades and Labour Hall, Grove House, High-rd., second Mondays in month.

MANCHESTER.—Sec., W. Addison, 111, West Park-street, Salford, Manchester. Branch meets 1st and 3rd Thursdays in month, 7.45 p.m.

PADDINGTON.—Branch meeting held on 2nd and 4th Fridays, 8 p.m., in room above the Co-operative Stores, 306, Kilburn Lane, W.9 (side door).

SOUTHEND-ON-SEA.—Sec., J. Bird, 5, Wellington-avenue, Westcliffe-on-Sea.

TOOTING.—Sec., E. Carnell, 110, Beechcroft Rd., S.W.17. Branch meets 2nd and 4th Fridays in the month. Discussion Circle 1st and 3rd Fridays, at 8 p.m., at Tooting Adult School, 971, Garratt Lane, S.W.17.

TOTTENHAM.—Secretary, 18, Woodlands Park Rd., N.15. Branch meets Fridays, Room 2, Trades Hall, 7, Bruce Grove, Discussion after branch business. Public invited.

WALTHAMSTOW.—Sec. S. E. Williams, 64, Bloxham-rd., Leyton, E.10. Branch meets at Workmen's Hall, High-st., every Monday.

WATFORD.—A. Lawson, Sec., 107, Kensington-avenue, Watford. Branch meets Mondays at 8.30 p.m. at Secretary's address.

WEST HAM.—Branch meets Thursdays at 8 p.m. at 167, Romford-rd., Stratford. Sec., P. Hallard, 22, Colegrave-rd., Stratford, E.

WOOD GREEN.—All communications to Sec., F. W. Godfrey, 71, Falkland Road, N.8. Branch meets 2nd and 4th Monday in month at 242, High Road, 8.30 p.m.

WOOLWICH.—Branch meets at 94, Griffin Road, Plumstead. Communications to Secretary at above address.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN.

OBJECT.—The establishment of a system of society based upon the common ownership and democratic control of the means and instruments for producing and distributing wealth by and in the interests of the whole community.

DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great HOLDS— Britain

That society as at present constituted is based upon the ownership of the means of living (i.e., lands, factories, railways, etc.) by the capitalist or master class, and the consequent enslavement of the working class by whose labour alone wealth is produced.

That in society, therefore, there is an antagonism of interests, manifesting itself as a class struggle, between those who possess but do not produce and those who produce but do not possess.

That this antagonism can be abolished only by the emancipation of the working class from the domination of the master class, by the conversion into the common property of society of the means of production and distribution, and their democratic control by the whole people.

That as in the order of social evolution the working class is the last class to achieve its freedom, the emancipation of the working class will involve the emancipation of all mankind, without distinction of race or sex.

That this emancipation must be the work of the working class itself.

That as the machinery of government, including the armed forces of the nation, exists only to conserve the monopoly by the capitalist class of the wealth taken from the workers, the working class must organise consciously and politically for the conquest of the powers of government, national and local, in order that this machinery, including these forces, may be converted from an instrument of oppression into the agent of emancipation and the overthrow of privilege, aristocratic and plutocratic.

That as political parties are but the expression of class interests, and as the interest of the working class is diametrically opposed to the interests of all sections of the master class, the party seeking working-class emancipation must be hostile to every other party.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain, therefore, enters the field of political action determined to wage war against all other political parties, whether alleged labour or avowedly capitalist, and calls upon the members of the working class of this country to muster under its banner to the end that a speedy termination may be wrought to the system which deprives them of the fruits of their labour, and that poverty may give place to comfort, privilege to equality, and slavery to freedom.

Those agreeing with the above principles and desiring enrolment in the Party should apply for membership form to secretary of nearest branch or at Head Office.

THE Socialist Standard

The Official Organ of **THE SOCIALIST PARTY** of Great Britain.

No. 303. Vol. 27.]

LONDON, NOVEMBER, 1929.

[MONTHLY, TWOPENCE.]

INDUSTRY AND THE BANKS.

WICKED BANKERS AND KIND CAPTAINS OF INDUSTRY.

Owing to high interest rates in New York and Berlin, and the consequent transfers of balances from London to those centres, the Bank-rate on September 26th, was increased from $5\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. to $6\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. At once the Press and the platform became a fierce battle-ground between those who charged the wicked bankers with "throttling industry," and the apologists who explained that this process, although painful, was in the best interests of the patient. The *Times* assured its readers on September 14th, when a rise was already being proposed, that failure to take this step would result in an increase in the cost of living. Lord Melchett (formerly Sir Alfred Mond) wrote in the *Sunday Express* on September 29th, under the title "Unemployed—by Order of the Bank," pointing out that if the *Times* policy were carried out industrial activity would be slowed down and unemployment would grow. What Lord Melchett said he wanted was that—

some of the hundreds of thousands of workers to-day walking the streets, idle, searching for employment, should be placed into productive industry, to increase the national wealth.

Mr. Philip Gee, speaking for the coal-owners, said (*Daily News*, 27th September):—

This rise is very unfortunate, coming at the present time, when many collieries are faced with the necessity of borrowing money for development, rationalisation, and mechanisation, and when many collieries already have large overdrafts at the bank. It will restrict development.

Seventeen manufacturers' associations and sixty individual company directors combined to send a memorandum to the Government demanding a fundamental

change in financial policy "if Great Britain is to retain her industrial importance" (*Daily Express*, October 8th). They protested that an increase of 1 per cent. in the rate of interest meant an additional burden of £25 million. Among the signatories were the Master Cotton Spinners' Associations, the British Wool Federation, and the National Union of Manufacturers.

Mr. E. G. Pretyma, President of the Land Union, added the protests of the farmers and landowners. He told the *Daily Herald* (October 8th) that "nearly all farmers and most landowners had bank overdrafts, and the usurious interest of $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. had to be paid now on these overdrafts."

Added to the clamour were the voices of the trade union officials, the *Daily Herald*, and the Independent Labour Party, all demanding prompt and drastic action against the villains of this piece—the financiers.

On the trade union side the oratorical laurels belong to Mr. Ben Tillett. He told an audience of trade unionists at Bristol on September 29th that "our financiers and usurers had contrived to put millions of the world's population under their heel." . . . "Our National Debt was an octopus, bleeding white the British nation." . . . "The banks were squeezing the life-blood out of British industry." (See *Daily Herald*, September 30th.)

According to the *Manchester Guardian's* report of the same speech, Mr. Tillett denounced these wicked men as "dragons of usury" exhibiting the "sardonic malignity of the sordid dogs in the mangers of British commerce, banking and usury."

A week later he became really angry. Then he said (*Times*, 4th October):—

If Mr. Montagu Norman were tried by Court-Martial he would be shot for raising the bank rate to 6½%. He should thank God that we were more merciful. He (Mr. Tillett) would let him off with a caution—and sack him.

Mr. James Maxton, M.P. and Chairman of the I.L.P., also had something to contribute to the discussion. He recalled

the period of the war when banks and financiers had manipulated credit and gold to enrich themselves, heedless of the consequences to the workers. (*Daily Herald*, September 30.)

In face of this show of heat it is not surprising that many workers who know little of the ways of the banks should have concluded that here was a matter of very great concern to them. Let us then consider the whole question, and start at the beginning by asking ourselves what are the banks and what is industry.

The banks are companies, owned by their shareholders, which receive the money of people who have a surplus, pay them interest on it, and lend it out to industrial and commercial concerns which are willing to pay a higher rate of interest for the use of the money than the banks pay to the depositors. Industry, the mines, the railways, the cotton factories, etc., also consists of companies owned by private individuals or bodies of shareholders. In both cases the shareholders put their money into these concerns with a view to making a profit. The bank depositors, whose money is lent out by the banks, are in effect investing it in industry in a roundabout way. The chief difference is that the person who deposits money in a bank can, at any time or at short notice, resume possession of the amount which he originally deposited, whereas the shareholders in a company may possibly find it difficult to sell his shares at a given moment except at some loss. On the other hand, the latter stands the chance of selling his shares at a profit and of receiving a much larger return than the banks find it necessary to pay their depositors. In brief, some investors desire a relatively higher degree of security and want to have their money easily accessible and therefore allow all or part of it to remain in the possession of a bank.

What it is important to notice is that the people who own and control industry and the people who own the money which the banks lend to the controllers of industry are similar in the important respect that they

are in the main propertied people, members of the capitalist class, able, because of their ownership, to live without working. On the other hand, the people who do the work of industry and of the banks, from the coal miner and the bank clerk to the mine manager and bank manager, are in the great majority of cases members of the working class. They do not own sufficient property to be able to live without working and must therefore sell their power to labour to the property owners or their agents. The amount they get as wages or salary is roughly speaking the amount which is sufficient to keep them alive and efficient and to enable them to bring up their families. What that amount is will vary, of course, from place to place and from one occupation to another, and will necessarily change according as prices rise or fall. It also involves a number of other factors. It is, however, prevented from rising much above the actual cost of living by the constant pressure of the unemployed who are able and willing to take the place of the employed man.

Having purchased the mental and physical powers of the workers for a day, a week, or a month, the employers then set them to work producing articles for sale. In general the value of the articles, after making all necessary deductions for cost of materials, wear and tear of machinery and other incidental expenses, is far above the amount paid in wages and salaries. It is out of that difference, that surplus, that the whole capitalist class derives its income.

It is customary, in this country at least, for the capitalist who invests his money in a factory or a mine or other business to have to rent the land from a landlord. It is also usual for him to depend to some extent on loans from a bank or loans from other investors who are prepared to lend in the form of debentures at a fixed rate of interest. The industrial capitalist is compelled, therefore, to hand over some share of the surplus to other capitalists who have invested in land or who lend money direct or through a bank. Naturally these three types of capitalist are continually trying to increase their respective shares at the expense of the others. If rents go up, one or both of the other two parties has to suffer. If interest rates go up the industrial capitalist or the landlord has to foot the bill.

The most obvious way in which these groups try to gain an advantage is by con-

trolling or influencing the Government. The political party in power looks after the interests of its friends. The group whose friends are not in power just as naturally tries to force the ruling faction to make concessions, the final deciding factor being the possibility of gaining the support of the electorate. It would, of course, be fatal for the capitalists in an industry to ask the electors to support the introduction of a protective tariff, or a reduction of a tax on the article in which they were interested, and to put forward their real reason, i.e., that they were merely trying to get larger profits. What they do is to try to persuade the voters that these measures are desirable "for the good of the country," or that they will "make work for the unemployed" or will "encourage trade." Any excuse serves so long as a sufficient number of voters can be induced to believe it. As a matter of course other sections of the capitalist class will resist these demands because they know that if any section gets an advantage one or other of the various sections of the capitalist class will have to pay for it, directly or indirectly, through increased taxation or through higher prices leading to higher wages, or in some other way. This is the great game of politics as played by the capitalist parties.

An excellent illustration was seen in the Derating Act passed by the last Government. Lord Melchett stated at the 1929 annual meeting of the Imperial Chemical Industries Ltd. that the company gained £200,000 a year relief from rates through that piece of legislation passed by the political friends of a group of industrial capitalists. (See report in *The Times*, 19th April, 1929.) Mr. Lloyd George, it may be remarked, estimated the figure at no less than £600,000, but Lord Melchett denied its accuracy.

For a like reason we have the industrialist capitalists demanding that the present Government take steps to compel the money-lending capitalists (the banks and their depositors) to lower the rate of interest. And it explains why industrialist capitalists like Lord Melchett's fellow director, Mr. Szarvasy, and Sir J. P. Benn, the evangelist of "individualism," are in favour of the nationalisation of the coal royalties, and the nationalisation of land respectively. (See *Manchester Guardian*, 18th September, 1928, and *Times*, 24th July, 1925.) In each case we see the in-

dustrial capitalist seeking to use political power for the purpose of helping himself at the expense of the capitalist who has put his money into coal-bearing or agricultural or building land.

In the present controversy the issues are just as plain. Imperial Chemical Industries Ltd. and other branches of industry are busy introducing new and expensive plant and machinery in order to meet intensifying competition from their foreign rivals. This process is a long one (Lord Melchett at the meeting referred to above stated that in some branches of his concerns it will take two years), and while it goes on high rates of interest have to be paid on very large sums of money borrowed from the banks or raised in the form of debentures. That is what all the fuss is about. As Sir E. W. Petter, of Petters Ltd., explained in a letter to *The Times* (9th October), these increased charges "cannot be passed on to the customer" (foreign competition will prevent that) and "must be paid out of the manufacturer's profits."

That is why Lord Melchett is so solicitous about the troubles of the unemployed; and why the *Times* is so deeply concerned lest your cost of living be raised. Lord Melchett is trying to get working class voters to back him up in a policy which will help him against the money-lending capitalists; and the *Times*, no more disinterested than he, tries to secure, by its reference to the cost of living, your support for a policy which is in the interests of the bankers, and against that of the industrial capitalists.

The whole question is one of the conflicting interests of sections of the capitalist class. It does not affect the workers' interests. They are robbed by the whole capitalist class, and the way in which the capitalists divide the spoils between themselves makes no difference whatever to the workers. When Lord Melchett talks about his desire to see the unemployed placed in productive industry "to increase the national wealth," and when Mr. Tillett laments that the bankers are upsetting "even the wonderful miracle of the mechanisation of industry" (*Manchester Guardian*, September 30th), they are both misrepresenting the real line of industrial development. Lord Melchett and his associates are concerned primarily not with making work or with increasing the national wealth, but with securing the maximum profit. Lord Melchett is a keen supporter of what

is called rationalisation, and he has himself defined it, not as a policy of increasing production, but as

the adjustment of production to consumption in any commodity. Basically it is simply the rational control of industry to ensure that, as far as possible, you do not produce more than your market can absorb. (*Daily Telegraph*, Jan. 14th, 1929.)

Mr. Tillett's "miracle of the mechanisation of industry" is the process which every worker knows and fears, the creation of more unemployment through the introduction of labour-saving machinery. Lord Melchett needs loans because his concerns are carrying out a costly reorganisation scheme to secure greater productivity per head of his workers; not *more* production, but *cheaper* production.

There is another factor which complicates this question of industry and the banks, but again a factor which does not concern the workers. The banks, being called upon to lend larger and larger sums of money to industrial and commercial concerns, are able more and more to insist that they or their nominees shall be given some share in the control of the borrowing companies. This they do partly to influence policy in order to safeguard their interests as lenders and to secure a greater share in the earnings of the company, and partly to use the connection as a means of securing new banking business at the expense of competing banks. But it is plain enough that this change in control, while naturally resented by the industrial capitalists, does not lead to any change in the position of the workers either for better or for worse. It will also be noticed that this struggle has no direct connection with the question of a high or low bank rate.

As against the policy of Mr. Tillett and Mr. Maxton and their respective parties which leads the workers to throw themselves into the fray on the side of the industrial capitalists, the Socialist Party points out that the whole question is of no concern except to the capitalists themselves. The Labour Research Department (Monthly Circular, July) estimates the 1928 profit of Lord Melchett's "Imperial Chemical Industries Ltd." as equal to £113 per head of the workers employed. But what does it matter to us whether that profit, totalling £6 million, goes wholly to the shareholders, or partly to the bank depositors? What does it matter to the workers whether their lives are controlled by Lord

Melchett, "captain of industry," or some new master, a "king of finance"?

When Mr. Maxton singles out the bankers as having enriched themselves during the war "heedless of the consequences to the workers" he forgets the cotton mill owners, the shipping owners, the coal-owners, the iron and steel interests, and all the other commercial and industrial capitalists who were striving with greater or less success to do the same. That is the object of all capitalists both during war and peace.

And who should know this better than Mr. Tillett? In 1929 he wants to shoot Mr. Montague Norman—banker. Many years ago he earned great hatred and great popularity by calling upon God to strike dead Lord Devonport, starver of dockers. Yet Lord Devonport was no banker, but head of a great trading firm.

H.

"SOCIALIST STANDARD."

BACK NUMBERS.

Owing to difficulties of storage, it has been decided to dispose of a large number of SOCIALIST STANDARDS issued between September, 1904, and August, 1914. All who want copies are therefore asked to apply to the Literature Secretary, at Head Office, at an early date. While it is impossible to supply complete sets for each year of issue during the period mentioned, particularly the earlier years, every effort will be made to supply series of copies for those who wish to complete their sets. Copies will be supplied at the price of 1d. each. A reduction will be made to members buying quantities.

EAST LONDON.

MEETINGS

have been arranged by the East London Branch to take place at 8 p.m. in the

BROMLEY PUBLIC HALL,
BOW ROAD,

On November 10th and December 1st.

Admission Free.

Questions and Discussion.
All Invited.

ASPECTS OF THE "WOMAN QUESTION."

(Based on Notes of a series of Lectures on "The Sexes in Evolution.")

(Continued.)

Many have contended that the work of propaganda among women requires essentially different methods than are used among men. Woman is dependent upon man—yes, that is true, at least of the majority. But what is man dependent on? A wage, which in turn depends on a job. Who owns the job? Not always the man who does it. So that woman's dependence and man's dependence are all of a piece—it is all part of the same problem. Where women have gone into industry they have shifted, to some extent, their economic dependence from husband or father, to that of an employer. But even so, it has only made her problem more identical with that of the working man.

I am unable at the moment to give the latest figures of the number of women employed, but this is relatively unimportant. Their actual industrial position is reflected by the amount of wages received by them. Here again actual figures are lacking, but the crucial point is this—the Capitalist system finds in the huge body of unemployed a source of strength in that they compete with each other in the labour market. Women further intensify this competition by the fact that they can be compelled to accept a lower wage than a man. The minimum wage of all labour being determined by the amount on which a man can live, it is taken for granted that this must be higher for a man than for a woman. Woman, whether true or not, is looked upon as having no dependents, and her known ability to live more cheaply than man is undoubtedly taken into account.

The same laws of competition, over-supply, etc., hold with the labourer, whether man or woman. There is no difference whatever in the way in which Capitalism exploits men and women. In the economic fight it has been the one who endeavoured to maintain life on the barest necessities, and who possessed at the same time the least power of resistance, who has been pushed to the wall—whether man or woman. As pointed out by J. A. Hobson—"It is not the difference of sex which is the chief factor in determining the industrial

position of woman. Machinery knows neither age nor sex, but chooses the labour embodied in man, woman or child which is the cheapest in relation to the degree of its efficiency."

Women, also, are badly organised—they are not good trade unionists. Possibly this is partly because she is by training domestic, and that such things as trade unions, politics, etc., have not come within her purview. Partly too, because she hopes that her entry into industry will not be permanent. . . .

As regards home and family life, even the most superficial observer will agree that the prevailing system exerts a harmful effect.

Take the case of marriage. It is a prevailing impression that marriages are based on the love and mutual respect of two persons for each other. So they are in many cases, but often with consequences of economic disaster. In a large number of cases, however, there is not the slightest doubt that girls enter into marriage for the express purpose of escaping from a life of toil in the office or factory. The marriages and social affairs of the idle rich we can leave out of account—their carryings-on would take volumes to describe.) So that from this standpoint alone we can see that it is not remarkable that when economic trouble arises domestic life is directly affected. A good deal of the existing unhappiness in working-class homes is traceable to this source. We all know of the misery entailed through couples being unable either to furnish or buy a house. Either there is a shortage of houses to let or a shortage of money to buy one. After so influencing the structure of family life as to make it conform to its requirements, and then helping to undermine the very foundations of this structure by its degrading conditions, Capitalism goes yet further and displays complete indifference to the fact that for thousands there are no homes at all! So cheaply is human life regarded. And yet if any lapse from the path of moral rectitude occurs, we are taught to look on it as a shame or a disgrace—that is unless one belongs to the upper ten. The more we look into it, the more do we see the necessity for the closer co-operation of men and women in the fight for the conquest of political power. Many advocates of women suffrage have only sought and worked for sex emancipation, quite failing to realise

that its full significance lies in a full social and political education for both sexes before its value can be fully utilized.

TOM SALA.

(To be continued.)

UNEMPLOYMENT AND THE PRINTING TRADES.

We print below a letter from a correspondent, together with our reply:—

S. Hackney, E.9.
22/9/29.

To Editor SOCIALIST STANDARD.

Dear Sir,

Upon perusal of the Socialist Party's pamphlet "Socialism," I am prompted to write of an aspect regarding machine production and its effect on the economic relationship of the working-class. Firstly, I will draw attention to page 3, where will be found workers in practically every trade, profession, and so forth, addressing, as a body, to the working-class the object of Socialism. And amongst them is instanced *printers* (my italics).

On page 19 I find a reference to the linotype machine and its economic results upon the compositors. In brief, without giving the full quotation, this wonderful machine has displaced men; made them unemployed, but not, I will venture to say, unemployable.

Permit me to give the facts. In 1899, the *Daily Mail* was the first firm to instal these machines. They were then producing an 8-page news-sheet. The staff of compositors was something like fifty. Since then the paper has developed from an 8-page to a 16-page production. Remembering, too, that the linotype sets text matter only, who other than the displaced compositors does the advertisements which monopolise more of the paper than the material composed by the linotype. This position is representative of all firms who installed the machine.

Next, in 1899, when the linotype was introduced in England from America, the membership of the London Society of Compositors was 11,415, so, according to the line of thought given in "Socialism," by now—1929—the membership should be numerically smaller. But the opposite is the case, and we find the membership of the Society stronger—14,690, to be precise, and the months of May, June and July found only an average of 16 members unemployed on the figures for those three months. How then can you reconcile these facts with that propounded in the pamphlet?

The explanation is simple. Take another industry. Consequent on the development of the tooth-brush industry, we find the wage-standard is low. With the result of intensive machine production the markets, at periods, get overstocked. That is the cause, Stock! Stock!! Stock!!! But not so in Print. There is no stock in that industry. And that, in my opinion, is the farcial aspect or position I regard for the Socialist Party to take as an example the linotype machine. Other than that point, of course, I am in full agreement.

Yours fraternally, TOM.

REPLY.

Our correspondent has read the Socialist Party's pamphlet "Socialism," and notes that in reference to the composition of the organization, printers, amongst others, are enumerated (page 3). Printers, whether they be linotype or monotype operators, or hand compositors, or machine managers, and so forth, are all members of the working class. Consequently there are in the ranks of the S.P.G.B. men and women of diverse occupations who have joined together in an endeavour to propagate the gospel of Socialism.

He is in difficulties about page 19, where in the introduction of a linotype machine into a printing office is given as an illustration of how hand-labour may be displaced by the machine. Let us quote the passage as it appears in the pamphlet:—

This wonderful appliance, though a great labour-saver, is profitable only to a certain circle of printers—those who have a considerable amount of book or newspaper work. But many are considering the pros and cons of its adoption. A very little will decide. An extra monthly magazine—or, perhaps, putting in a machine, by saving two or three mens room, will avoid an expensive removal to larger premises.

Now suppose wages rise, immediately the doubters are decided. They adopt the machine and each machine throws three or four compositors into the street.

It is, indeed, difficult to understand the reasoning of our correspondent, for, while he writes to take exception to the passage quoted above, the significant admission of our correctness creeps in when he says, "but not, I will venture to say, unemployable." (Closing words of his second paragraph.) Again, later on, he asks, "who other than the displaced compositors does the advertisements?"

Our critic then goes on to give what he considers to be the facts. He says: "In 1899 the *Daily Mail* was the first firm to instal these machines. They were then producing an eight-page news-sheet. The staff of compositors was something like fifty. Since then the paper has developed from an eight-page to a sixteen-page production. Remembering, too, that the linotype sets text matter only, who, other than the displaced compositors does the advertisements, which monopolise more of the paper than the material composed by the linotype. This position is representative of all firms who installed the machine."

We would suggest to our correspondent

that before he starts "distributing" the "facts," he should take the trouble to verify them. The *Daily Mail* was first published on May 1st, 1896. (See "Mystery of the *Daily Mail*," page 100; or "Everyman Encyclopædia.") Also an agreement for machine composition was signed between representatives of the London Newspapers and Master Printers and the London Society of Compositors in July, 1896.

The facts would have been more informative had they been more definite. For instance, "something like fifty" for the number of compositors employed when the production was an eight-page one, and no mention at all of those required for the sixteen-page edition does not help towards an intelligent understanding of the situation. Our critic goes on to ask, "who, other than the displaced compositor does the advertisements which monopolise more of the paper than the material composed by the linotype?" Of course, some of the displaced compositors may get a look in on the advertisements, seeing that the paper is now, on his own showing, twice its former size; and the tendency has for a long time past been for newspapers to develop more and more into an advertising medium.

This is where our critic misunderstands our point. We do not deny that an industry can expand and even expand faster when labour is eliminated by machines. The essential point is that more work is done by relatively fewer workers. An instance of this may be taken from the Census of Production figures published in the *Board of Trade Journal* (21st April, 1927). Dealing with the "Printing and Publication of Newspapers and Periodicals," it is stated:

Net output per head, 1907	...	£190
" " 1924	...	£546
Persons employed, 1907	...	43,644
" " 1924	...	56,837

Be it noted that this increase is much greater than the increase in prices between 1907 and 1924.

Because our correspondent fails to grasp these points he wants to know how we reconcile our statement with regard to the displacement of hand labour by machines when the membership of the London Society of Compositors in 1899 was 11,415 and is now 14,690?

The next statement in his letter, which says that "the months of May, June and July found only an average of sixteen

members unemployed," is incorrect. Let us take the figures as given in the *London Typographical Journal*:—

May 4	May 11	May 18	May 25
25	55	92	118
June 1	June 8	June 15	June 22
155	151	171	147
July 6	July 13	July 20	July 27
169	205	230	228

If our questioner will take the trouble to work these figures out, he will discover that the average for the thirteen weeks is 145!

Again, notice should be taken that the compositors have extraordinarily good superannuation benefits which, combined with the Contributory Pension Act, has a tendency to remove from the labour market a proportion of seekers after work. Dealing with the unemployment figures for the years 1921-1928, the Annual Report, 1928, of the L.S.C. states:—"Members do not need to be reminded that this substantial reduction has been brought about by the operation of the scheme of superannuation combined with the policy of restriction of membership." Now this restriction of entrants and the limitation of apprentices all helps to swell the general army of unemployed.

We consider it unnecessary to follow our article at length to the tooth-brush industry. Suffice it to say that here again he is in error in imagining that in the realm of print there is no stock. Evidently he has never heard or seen such things as receipt books, rent books, registers, to mention but a few that come to mind at once, that can be obtained for the asking.

S.W.T.

CLASSES AT HEAD OFFICE.

The following classes at Head Office will be run during the winter.

MONDAYS

"INDUSTRIAL HISTORY"

Instructor, G. McCLATCHIE.

WEDNESDAYS

"ECONOMICS"

Instructor, A. BEALES.


FRIDAYS

WRITER'S CLASS

Instructor, E. HARDY.

Commence 8 p.m.

Admission Free.

 Send your TINFOIL to the General Secretary at the Head Office—It will help to Raise Funds.

OFFICIAL NOTICE.

All communications for the Executive Committee, Subscriptions for the SOCIALIST STANDARD, Articles, and Correspondence submitted for insertion therein, should be addressed—The Socialist Party of Great Britain, 42, Great Dover Street, London, S.E.1, to whom Money Orders should be made payable.

The meetings of the Executive Committee are held at the Head Office, every Tuesday, at 7.30 p.m.

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTIONS.

Twelve Months, post free... .. 2s. 6d.
Six Months, post free... .. 1s. 3d.

The Socialist Standard,

NOV.,



1929

AFFLUENCE IN THE U.S.A.

Comfort! that's what we want. And prosperity also, peace and prosperity. And what about affluence? Ah! affluence; that is the stuff. Give us affluence, and all else follows. And to think that the problem has been solved. Yes, solved. The *Daily Telegraph*—a respectable and reputable organ, surely—has said so. As recently as September 18th, too. The dull business of reporting has its compensations after all, for what nominally could be duller than the reporting of luncheon and dinner speeches? There was the luncheon the other day, for instance, of the American Chamber of Commerce, at which a Mr. Thomas J. Watson let himself go. The *Daily Telegraph* thought it worth half a column, and headed it, attractively enough:

"MACHINE AS THE KEY TO PROSPERITY."

"AMERICAN WORKERS' AFFLUENCE."

"THE COMFORT AGE."

Then followed the tale told by Mr. Thomas Watson:—

"Our experience of the application of machinery in industry," he said, "is that it makes men dear and their products cheap." From this he developed the usual bilge of the introduction of machinery ulti-

mately reducing prices, resulting in wider distribution, and so on. Following which he gave a few figures. Now figures are not attractive things, and most people simply hear them or see them and rapidly glance at something more arresting. But these, in view of the headlines, are really interesting. In 1914, he said, the average annual wage was \$590, roughly, we will say, £2 8s. per week.

"Adjusting the average wage for changes in the buying power of money, the worker in 1925 received at least 35 per cent. more than in 1914."

And that is affluence. That is the Comfort Age. The equivalent of a 16s. rise on a weekly wage of £2 8s. is affluence. Save the mark!

True, Mr. Thompson did not permit himself the words comfort, prosperity and affluence. But one course we can recommend him. He should get into touch with Mr. G. De Vere, who has recently returned from a tour of U.S.A. He was telling us all about it over the radio about a fortnight ago, and just as the spectator sees most of the game, so the visitor apparently often sees more than the native. One of his first ports of call was a camp of the Y.W.C.A. in the Hudson Valley, where a delegate meeting of industrial women was in progress. Here he gathered that normal unemployment was very serious, although no reliable figures existed, and that the previous winter's unemployment had been more serious than usual. Groups of women workers were beginning to push for better social conditions.

At a big factory near Boston he saw the conveyor-belt system in operation, and later he found few factories where the system was not in use. The workers stand or sit on either side of a moving belt, and each contributes some small operation to the article on the belt, until the finished product is delivered at the end. One can imagine joy-in-work reaching its apex in the belt system. Experiments were being conducted in changing the speed of the belt at different times of the day, and in what is called psychological study. Several foremen he interviewed regretted the early scrapping of men in the prime of life by the introduction of machinery, and also the rapid wearing out of those who were retained. In Mr. De Vere's own words, "from twenty to twenty-five years was the average period of efficiency at fast work,

THE LABOUR PARTY CONFERENCE.

Under the chairmanship of Mr. Herbert Morrison, M.P., the 29th Annual Conference of the Labour Party was held at Brighton during early October.

The Conference was the first to be held during the lifetime of a Labour Government, and the criticisms, therefore, were levelled at their own colleagues.

Mr. Herbert Morrison, in his opening address, reviewed the "record of success" of the Government, particularly in relation to foreign affairs, to which a great part of the time was devoted. He was received with satisfied applause from the whole of the delegates. Mr. A. Henderson, Mr. Philip Snowden, and Mr. J. H. Thomas were each allowed a day in which to state their respective parts in the "success." Mr. Morrison was guilty of a lapse that was strange in one who recently announced that the Government (in which he is Minister of Transport) were the "friends of the business man." He said (*Daily Herald*, October 1st, 1929):—

We go forward to make material wealth the servant of mankind and not the master of mankind. . . . We aim at a new society—the Socialist Commonwealth—not as an end in itself but as a stepping-stone to the mental and spiritual regeneration of mankind. . . . It is a great change we seek, it can only be secured if the hearts as well as the minds of the people are elevated.

Such misty stuff might as easily have come from any parson or most of those politicians who sing the praises of the Capitalist system, save for the use of the words "Socialist Commonwealth." Material wealth is the servant of "mankind." The obstacle preventing the majority of mankind, that is the workers, from enjoying it is that the means and instruments for producing and distributing wealth are owned and controlled by a small section of "mankind"—the Master Class. From this ownership all the economic evils which afflict the working-class arise: poverty, insecurity, and a social existence that is limited to the production of wealth and the reproduction of themselves as wealth producers serving only to pile up wealth for their masters. We seek to change this by transferring ownership of the means of living from private hands to society as a whole. What is the change of heart necessary for this simple procedure? This tale of making yourselves fit for a new Society

after that it was generally a question of lighter or slower work, or the scrap-heap. In fast Detroit shops the period would be shorter." Craftsmen do not earn so much as fast repetitive workers. Some Britishers he asked for a comparison of the conditions in the two countries, said the U.S.A. was a better country to earn money in, but not so good to live in. Social life as we understand it, does not exist in the U.S.A. factory towns.

In Hartford, Connecticut, he heard of some amazing increases in workers' production by means of motion study with micro-motion pictures taken on the job. Trade-unionism generally is at a discount, the company-union being almost universal.

Of course, in a land of comfort, prosperity and workers' affluence, such social safety-valves as unemployment insurance and sickness provision would be anomalies. One worker he asked what men did when out-of-a-job, replied, "it is a case root hog or die." Doubtless they would die rather than falsify the *Telegraph's* headlines.

In a summing-up at the end of his address, De Vere said, "for the mass of the workers, I doubt whether the standard of life is much, if at all, higher than in England. Life is expensive, especially with regard to such things as rent and clothing."

So there you have it. Either the *Daily Telegraph* uses its own private dictionary for everyday words, or else comfort, prosperity and affluence have aspects with which we are not acquainted. We cannot fit any of the three words to a life spent alongside a conveyor-belt, with every physical movement so studied as to eliminate every jerk of the muscles that does not spell profit. Big wages may mean anything, but it is of the nature of wages inevitably to be a reflex of social standards. Where big wages equal big rent, food and clothing bills, and little wages equal little dittoes, the words big and little cease to distinguish anything real. And when, in addition, the journey to the scrap-heap has become abbreviated to a twenty or twenty-five year period, one again wonders whether the editor of the *Daily Telegraph* contemplates changing his occupation for one of comfort, prosperity and affluence. Doubtless his fatal weakness for self-sacrifice will assert itself, and we shall find him denying himself the temptations of American affluence for many years yet.

is the equivalent of the Christian doctrine of being good now in the hope of a reward in the sweet bye and bye.

AN I.L.P. BOGEY.

Miss Dorothy Jewson was responsible for resurrecting the latest side-tracking reform endorsed by the I.L.P.—family allowance. She moved a resolution calling upon the Government to introduce

increasing taxation of the wealthy to provide for a wide development of the social services, including an effective system of children's allowances. (*Daily Herald*, Oct. 2nd, 1929.)

The debate on this question was a long one, and the remarkable feature about it was that most of the delegates were of the opinion that such a measure would be effective in permanently improving the conditions of the workers.

But would it?

The price of the workers' labour power on an average covers the cost of keeping himself and his family. If a worker receives from the State an allowance which covers the cost of keeping his children, then the wages he receives from the employers will fall to a level which will cover the cost of his and his wife's keep only. Where and when such a scheme has been introduced it has been of benefit chiefly to the capitalists. The working class as a whole gain nothing from it.

On the appeal of Mr. A. Henderson to refer the question to next year's conference, the resolution was lost on a card vote, the votes being cast in proportions of about 3 to 2.

UNEMPLOYMENT.

Mr. J. H. Thomas related his difficulties in trying to find work for the unemployed. He stated that

unemployment could not be solved by merely pouring out money, but by finding new markets for our goods.

The heads of railways, harbours, docks, and electrical undertakings, etc., had been invited by the Government to private discussion on providing employment by making machinery efficient. (*Daily Herald*, Oct. 2nd, 1929.)

The process was not explained. Mr. Wheatley's contribution to the debate was to the effect that Mr. J. H. Thomas was wasting his time. "While Capitalism remains there would also remain the victims of unemployment," which was rather unkind of Mr. Wheatley, and also inconsistent with his own support of Capitalism and the Labour Party which administers it.

Jimmie, after all, was doing his best. And doesn't he get £5,000 a year for trying so hard? Doubtless Mr. Wheatley is sore because he has lost the Ministerial job he had in 1924.

The debate showed that the delegates believed that the "problem of unemployment" could not be solved. Their main plank was that the administration of unemployment insurance by the officials of the Ministry of Labour was inhuman. It must be "humanised," they said. Hell, humanise cancer or remove it!

It is surprising with what gusto and indignation the Labour Party will shout and make a great noise about effects while accepting their causes. Truly, "much ado about nothing."

DISARMAMENT.

Dealing with Mr. Ramsay MacDonald's visit to the U.S.A. and the question of the reduction in the number of warships in the fleets of Great Britain and the U.S.A. respectively, Mr. Henderson "outlined his hopes for an early world conference and disarmament." He said:—

If that conference comes up to our expectations we shall have opened up an era in which we may see the vast sums hitherto spent on armaments put to better purposes. (*Daily Herald*, Oct. 3rd, 1929.)

What does that mean? Nothing! On being called upon to answer a question put by a woman delegate concerning complete disarmament, Mr. Henderson said that "he only wished those who held the questioner's views would say what they meant by total or complete disarmament. If they thought the problem out they would see they were asking what was impossible. What they must get down to was reasonable police-forcing."

Precisely, Mr. Henderson, and you are administering the Capitalist System, and whilst it exists the interests of the different national groups of capitalists can be defended, in the last resort, only by force. But why the cant and humbug about disarmament and world's peace. In the circumstances Mr. MacDonald's visit to America is not a "mission of peace" or a question concerning "disarmament." In the past, the bow and arrow, the sword, the musket, and many other primitive weapons have in their time been very efficient and up-to-date means of warfare. But as new methods are developed and introduced, so the older methods are relegated to the scrap heap as

useless. To-day aerial and gas warfare has developed so rapidly that many comparatively new cruisers are as obsolete as the bow and arrow as a means of destruction. Aeroplanes loaded with the necessary implements could spread desolation and disease, and almost raze to the ground large towns and industrial centres in a few days. It is noteworthy that politicians are never heard proposing the abolition of aerial warfare and the instruments of it. A "war in the air" would be much cheaper than war fought under the older methods, and how easily civil aircraft can be quickly transformed into fighting planes. The way to abolish war lies not in painstaking attempts to get the capitalist class to disarm, but in the abolition of the capitalist system.

Similarly with our economic problems; if all the schemes of new bridges and roads; making the machinery of production more efficient; the "humanising of the dole"; earlier old age pensions, family allowances, etc., are put into operation, the workers would still be faced with the problems of Capitalism as they are at present. The only solution is its abolition and the establishment of Socialism.

The conference ended with the singing of the "Red Flag" to an accompaniment of a violin played by a Cabinet Minister (F. O. Roberts, Minister of Pensions).

Did they sing the third verse?

"It suits to-day the Meek and Base,
Whose thoughts are fixed on Pelf and Place,

To cringe before the Rich Man's frown,
And haul the sacred colour down."

Apparently they did not.

It might have disturbed their happy and contented frame of mind. For Mr. George Lansbury, on being asked by a *Daily Herald* reporter, "What he thought of the conference," replied:

"Fine, everyone is going home happy, and what more could you want." (*Daily Herald*, 5/10/1929.)

Comment on that statement could only be made in words as lurid as Mr. Lansbury's are placid.

H. W.

GET TOGETHER!

Readers of the "Socialist Standard" who desire to be put into communication with other readers in their district are invited to notify the General Secretary, at 42 Great Dover Street, S.E.1.

"WORK FOR ALL."

The *Sunday Pictorial*, October 6th, 1929, gives prominence to an article by Mr. G. Ward Price, who, according to the headlines, "shows that industry is suffering from several definite ailments. If it were 'rationalised and brought up to date, we should not have a capable worker unemployed.'"

"There is no mystery about what is 'wrong with the great British export 'trades,' says Mr. Price. 'Their costs of production are too high.'"

Further, he says, "There are only two remedies for unemployment. . . . One is 'the compulsory rationalisation of our big 'industries on lines of which America and 'Germany furnish the example, and the 'other is the reduction of Trade Union restriction.'"

See how great minds work! The problem of unemployment has baffled each succeeding Government since Governments realised there was unemployment; yet Mr. Price—in his spare time—has placed the whole question—ailment, cause and cure—within the understanding of the least intelligent.

The ailment: cost of production too high. The cause: failure to adopt up-to-date methods, and Trade Union restrictions on output. The cure: limit the latter and rationalise industry.

Mr. Price may be guilty of some slight exaggeration when he says the result will be jobs for every capable worker. That fullness of employment has not yet been reached by America or Germany, although, he says, they furnish examples of rationalisation we might copy.

Every capitalist knows—even if he doesn't know what his capital is invested in—that reduced cost of production is necessary if markets are to be extended. Every modern concern is run on that basis, even the most backward concerns believe in forcing the biggest return for every penny spent in wages. There is no question with the capitalist about reducing unemployment. So far as he is concerned he desires to increase it. If he rationalises his concern he reduces the number of workers employed while increasing the amount of the product. He may not, it is true, reduce the number of workers in his own factory, but workers must be displaced somewhere if he succeeds in capturing markets previously held by his

competitors. For, despite all the bunkum talked and written about new markets, no-one has yet discovered how to unload commodities on some planet across the ether.

Markets are the chief concern of capitalists. Melchett, Ford, and all the rest of the self-advertising industrial magnates are constantly proclaiming industrial warfare against competitors in every country. They carry on the fight by reducing the cost of production; by reducing the number of workers employed. The huge modern concerns, linked together—often across national boundaries—with the set purpose of achieving world monopoly, organise, train and eliminate until they have the pick of the labour market working at top speed; with the aid of the latest machinery. An army of workers, trained like athletes to smash, by the cheapness of their products, those concerns opposed to their masters. According to their degree of success the unemployed millions increase. There is no escape from this reasoning. The world's markets are limited. As a rule what is gained by one concern is lost by others. The markets that are won by England, if we can speak of nations when capital is international, are lost by Germany, France, or some other country.

Mr. Price's cure for unemployment is, therefore, merely a statement of capitalist method for the benefit of capitalists. It means for the working-class not less unemployment, but more. It means division of the workers into groups and industrial armies straining every nerve to capture world markets for their masters by cheapening their products. Each worker in mad competition with his neighbour to keep his job, and organised on a grand scale to throw men out of work across the seas or the national boundaries.

Trade Union restrictions on output are mere pills for an earthquake, in this colossal industrial struggle. Canute commanding the tides was scarcely more ludicrous than Trade Unionists who imagine they can slow the march of capitalism by going slow themselves.

The working-class forms the great bulk of society. They produce all wealth. Instead of owning the wealth themselves they allow the capitalist class to own and market it. Born and educated in a capitalist world, it is hard for them to conceive of any method of distributing wealth other than by exchange.

The capitalist method is ownership of the means of wealth production by the capitalist class; enslavement of the working-class by compelling them to sell their energy for wages, and setting them to the production of commodities to be sold on the world's markets. It is this method, this system, that causes unemployment and poverty, not the high cost of production and Trade Union restrictions, and the only cure is the removal of the cause; the abolition of capitalism.

All workers organised in the mad competitive struggle for markets, as well as the millions of unemployed should learn the truth about capitalism. They should organise with the Socialist Party for its overthrow, and for the establishment of a system where production and distribution will be carried on for the people by the people themselves.

Class ownership of the means of life is the cause of working-class misery. Substitute ownership by the people, production and distribution by the people—leaving out the cash basis—and unemployment will no longer be the name with which we shall designate the long periods when our labour is not required. Modern methods of production can satisfy all our needs and leave us with ample leisure for enjoyment.

F. F.

"Morgan was undoubtedly the greatest sociologist of the past century, and in his monumental work (1871) laid a solid foundation for the study of the family and kinship systems; he formulated a scheme of the evolution of the family, based on a study of the classificatory system of relationships, of which he was the discoverer."

A. C. HADDON, "History of Anthropology."

Saturday Evening Meetings

at

42, GREAT DOVER STREET, S.E.1.

November 2nd.	...	Lecture.
" 9th.	...	Play-reading.
" 16th.	...	Open Discussion.
" 23rd.	...	Social.
" 30th.	...	Lecture.
December 7th.	...	Play-reading.
" 14th.	...	Open Discussion.
" 28th.	...	Social.

JAMES RAMSAY MACDONALD: LABOUR'S MAN OF DESTINY.

By H. Hessel Tiltman. Jarrold's. 352 pages. 21s.)

This is a book about James Ramsay MacDonald, P.C., M.P. It is also as much a sketch of the Labour Party, of which he is held to have been the creator.

Ramsay MacDonald is portrayed as a man of great strength of character, who by sheer eloquence and intellectual ability is able to dominate and discipline the Labour Party, in spite of the I.L.P. "ginger" group of unruly schoolboys. An example is given (page 164) of an unofficial gathering of responsible Labour leaders who in 1924 met to discuss whether it was expedient to form a Government with the support of considerably less than a third of the number of seats in the House of Commons. They decided unanimously that it was not expedient. Mr. Ramsay MacDonald arrived upon the scene, and having listened to their arguments, proceeded to riddle them. In a very short time every man there was in agreement with him that they should take office. In contrast, we are presented with another side of his character, his "aloofness" and reserve, his love of the country and of quiet family life, and his having forsaken an academic career to which he is naturally inclined. Mr. Tiltman almost gives the impression that, but for this sacrifice by Mr. MacDonald of his liking for the academic life, the Labour Party would not have existed.

There are many people who hold the opinion that the Labour Party and the I.L.P. in the past were "more socialist" and "more revolutionary" than they are to-day.

Mr. Tiltman's book dispels the illusion. The policy of the Labour Party and its affiliated bodies, right from its inception, was reformist. The term socialism when it is used, is defined as being synonymous with municipal tramways, waterworks, and other Government services. Abundant material in support of this is reproduced from speeches and articles, and from local and parliamentary election programmes.

After the General Election of 1906, 29 Labour M.P.'s found their way to the House of Commons. (In the preceding Parliament there had been only four.) This was largely due to "compacts" and "understand-

ings" with the Liberals. According to Mr. MacDonald one very important factor was the discontent that set in after the Boer War, which made their propaganda, which included a "criticism" of that campaign, acceptable to a larger percentage of the electorate. (See appendix, page 287.)

The author leads us up to the war. The Labour Party, after having drawn up a resolution in opposition to the Government's "policy which had produced the war," deserted MacDonald after the debate in the House of Commons, almost to a man. It must, however, always be remembered that Mr. MacDonald's stand on the war was never based upon the Socialist refusal to defend the interests of the national groups of the capitalist class, but upon opposition to the Government's foreign policy. He was of the opinion that, when "we were in it, it had to go on." Several speeches, articles, and letters (including the recruiting letter sent to the Mayor of Leicester) are reproduced in this book.

To those who lay great stress upon the fact that Ramsay MacDonald risked political suicide because of his war policy it may also be pointed out that Mr. MacDonald did not imagine that he was permanently destroying his career. He made a speech in the House of Commons on August 3rd, 1914 (see appendix C, page 285), and said: "I not only know, but I feel that the feeling of the House is against us. I have been through this before, and 1906 came as part recompense." As indicated above, the 1906 elections showed a tremendous comparative increase of seats in the Labour Party's favour. Far from anticipating political suicide it would seem that Mr. MacDonald expected his policy of criticism to capitalise in an eventual increase in the Labour Party's representation in the House of Commons.

Mr. MacDonald is an astute politician, but he seems to have made some miscalculations in 1914—as, indeed, did many others.

For the rest, the book is sketchy and makes somewhat tedious reading. The author is too anxious to show Mr. MacDonald as a "great" man. That MacDonald has broken down the obstacles of a humble start in life, has been a good husband and a father may be very true. But how "great" would he have been had he preached Socialism, instead of preaching the advanced Liberal doctrines on which the Labour Party is built? Like others, he would have lived in comparative obscurity,

his qualities unnoticed because they did not bear the hall mark of success as estimated in a capitalist world. H. W.

TO OUR READERS IN READING.

Toilers and moilers who live in Reading you have every reason for getting thoroughly infuriated. It is unfortunate that one of your shopkeepers should have been so mysteriously murdered. It has made your town notorious for a while.

For this notoriety you are primarily indebted to the stunt press, ever ready to seize upon tragedy as a means to increase the profits of their shareholders.

What have you to say, however, to the way in which that respectable sheet, the *Times*, describes your behaviour when the news came out that Mr. Drew, the actor and suspect, was acquitted? Let us quote their comment:—

An unbalanced rabble has also treated him as a hero. To observers at a distance, as no doubt to the more judicious citizens of Reading, this exhibition of popular hysteria on so serious an occasion as an inquest on a murder must be thoroughly repugnant. (*Times*, Oct. 11th, 1929.)

We regret that it is difficult for us to influence your behaviour—the subscribers to our official organ, THE SOCIALIST STANDARD, being relatively small. In this respect the *Times* will probably share our complaint, comparing its sales with those of the penny papers. We can call to mind, however, that in August, 1914, a Serbian prince was murdered. The whole of the *organised rabble* on this occasion tumbled over themselves in their attempts to make heroes and corpses of every mother's son throughout the world. Several, no doubt, came from Reading.

You were not even consulted about the honour which was then thrust upon you.

The history of that colossal tragedy may well be brought to mind.

That the joyless nature of existence which the working class are forced to lead under Capitalism should make them so regardless of murdering one another in Capitalist wars, is also to be regretted. Such conduct, however, is explained by the conditions of Capitalist society, with its permanent unemployment, its poverty, its monotonous drudgery and insecurity of life. To many workers in 1914 war appeared almost as a relief. It could not, they thought, be much worse than the ills they

knew. The part which the Capitalist Press plays in time of war is too well known.

For them—the *Times* among the number—no act was too low in vile cunning; no scheme too diabolical and murderous to secure the approbation of those whose business it is to send "dumb heroes up the line to death."

We Socialists in 1914 did not join the *Times* in its support of that mad, murderous slaughter. We did not ask that the world should be made a graveyard to satisfy the money lusts of the class which the *Times* champions.

Then as now, we appeal to you to try and catch the inspiration of our message. At present men and women are hardened and embittered by the needless competition for employment which is an essential feature of Capitalism. They are, moreover, when Capitalist interests demand it, perfected in the arts of mass murder. Then, finally, they are denounced by their masters' Press because they exhibit in 1929 some of the qualities which the *Times* found so laudable fifteen years ago.

In contrast with the preaching of the *Times*, consistent only in the respect that it always serves Capitalism, we offer the message that you should organise with us for Socialism, a system of society in which production would be carried on co-operatively in the interests of the whole of society, not for the profit of a few, as it is to-day. O.C.I.

POLITICS: INTERNATIONAL, NATIONAL OR LOCAL?

On which of these three fronts should the revolutionary party of the workers concentrate their efforts? This question is a common one at Socialist meetings.

Our reply is, that conditions must always determine policy. The Socialist Party can go no faster than the desires and understanding of the workers. Our mission is to extend that understanding along all three fronts. But which should be given preference? comes the follow-up question. The answer is that our activities will be guided by the resources at our disposal. At present these resources are small. There are hardly any districts in London, for example, where Socialists are in sufficient numbers to make possible at present the election of Socialists at Local Council elections.

Certainly if it were now the case that any district or locality displayed a sufficient desire for Socialism and candidates were elected, our propaganda would be broadcasted from a "louder sounding-board."

This in itself is of considerable value in making more widely known the general principles of Socialism. It is to propaganda on a wide and scattered front—here and abroad, wherever our word penetrates, that our energies are devoted.

Unlike the Communist Party, dominated by the rulers of Russia, we do not think that the workers will rally to our side merely because we call upon them to do so. If in the future history of Socialist Politics one geographical area becomes stronger than another in its desire for Socialism, unlike the Bolshevik policy in Russia, the Socialist policy would depend upon the forces of the Socialist Party in other countries.

The revolutionary workers' party will not try to go faster than its abilities to travel—those abilities being dependent on understanding of our class and their organisation.

Therefore, at the November Council Elections we shall indulge in no wild outbursts of activity on the fields of local politics. Our policy will be, as in the past, to continue to proclaim the principles of Socialism.

Our ability to do this is determined by the support we receive from those who want Socialism.

Should these lines meet the eye of any of those many friends that we are continually meeting, who tell us, "I have been a Socialist for — years," whilst still remaining outside the ranks of the Socialist Party—may we once again ask them to consider the desirability of enjoying the unique pleasure—in these days when docile placidity appears to reign supreme—of exercising the courage of their convictions. Activity in a Socialist organisation gives such an opportunity. O.C.I.

TOTTENHAM.

LECTURES

AT
TRADES & LABOUR HALL,
5 Bruce Grove,

ON
NOVEMBER 10th and NOVEMBER 24th

MR. BELLOC AND THE SERVILE STATE.

In our October issue we quoted from the *Co-operative News* (September 7th), the following passage from their report of an address by Mr. Hilaire Belloc:—

Under Socialism all men were to be in the servile state. There were to be no free men ordering other men about, but the politicians were to do that instead.

We invited Mr. Belloc to defend his mention of Socialism in connection with the Servile State.

We have received from him the following letter, from which it will be seen that Mr. Belloc was mis-reported:—

"Kings Land,
"Shipley, Horsham,
"October 8th, 1929.

"The Editor, THE SOCIALIST STANDARD,

"Dear Sir,

"I don't know who wrote that sentence as being mine. I never said it or wrote it. The Servile State does not mean the Socialist State: it means a State in which the larger number are compelled directly by law—not indirectly, by economic pressure—to work for the benefit of the rest. In my book, the "Servile State," I show how the tendency of which such a condition would be the final result, has now been established and is increasing in force.

"Very faithfully yours,

"H. BELLOC."

S.P.G.B. PROPAGANDA MEETINGS

LONDON DISTRICT.	
Sunday ...	Canning Town, Beckton Road, 11.30 a.m. Clapham Common, 3.30 p.m. Tottenham, West Green Corner, 11.30 a.m. Tooting, Garrett Lane, Tooting Broadway, 7.30 p.m. Victoria Park, 11.30 a.m. Paddington, Prince of Wales, 11.30 a.m.
Mondays ...	Camberwell, Wren Road, 7.30 p.m. Clerkenwell, Garnault Place, 8 p.m.
Wednesdays ...	Forest Gate Station, 8 p.m.
Thursdays ...	Becontree, Rodney St. Ilford, 8 p.m.
Fridays ...	Clerkenwell, Acton St., Grays Inn Rd. 8 p.m. Hackney, Paragon Road and Mare Street, 8 p.m.
Saturdays ...	Wood Green, Jolly Butchers Hill, 8 p.m. Leyton, Corner Grange Park, 7.30 p.m.
HANLEY BRANCH.	
Sundays ...	Hanley Market Square, 7 p.m. Burslem, St. John Square, 7 p.m.
GLASGOW.	
Sundays ...	West Regent Street, 7.15 p.m.

BRANCH DIRECTORY.

BATTERSEA.—Sec., 2, Hanbury-road, S.W.11. Branch meets Thursday, 8.30 p.m. at The Waiting Room, Latchmere Baths, entrance in Burns-road. Discussion second Thurs. in month.

BECONTREE.—Sec., Hy. Gratton, 4, Drummond Ave., Brooklands, Romford. Branch meets 1st and 3rd Wednesdays at 7.30, at above address.

BIRMINGHAM.—Sec., E. Jesper, 32, Rollason-rd., Erdington. Branch meets The Continental Cafe, Moor St., 1st and 3rd Sundays at 11 a.m.

CENTRAL.—Membership obtained only through the Ex. Committee. Applications to General Sec.

EAST LONDON.—Sec. W. E. McHaffie. Communications to Secretary, S.P.G.B., c/o 141 Bow Road. Branch meets every Friday at 8 p.m. at above address. Discussion after Branch business. Public invited.

GLASGOW.—Branch meets Friday, 8 p.m., at Herald League Book Stall, 39, Shuttle Street, Glasgow. A. Shaw, 118, Henderson Street, Glasgow, C.1.

HACKNEY.—Branch meets Arcadian Cafe, 42, Amherst Road, Hackney, 1st and 3rd Mondays in month, 8 p.m., Discussions 9.30. Communication on to Sec. as above.

HANLEY.—Branch meets Tuesdays, Working Men's Club, Glass-st.

ISLINGTON.—Branch meets Wednesdays, 8.30, at 144, Seven Sisters-rd., Holloway, N. Sec., A. Baker, 18, Orpingley Road, N.7.

LEYTON.—Sec., 396, Lea Bridge-rd., Leyton. Branch meets 8 p.m., Trades and Labour Hall, Grove House, High-rd., second Mondays in month.

MANCHESTER.—Sec., W. Addison, 111, West Park-street, Salford, Manchester. Branch meets 1st and 3rd Thursdays in month, 7.45 p.m.

PADDINGTON.—Branch meeting held on 2nd and 4th Fridays, 8 p.m., in room above the Co-operative Stores, 306, Kilburn Lane, W.9 (side door).

SOUTHEND-ON-SEA.—Sec., J. Bird, 5, Welling-ton-avenue, Westcliffe-on-Sea.

SOUTHWARK.—Branch meets Fridays at 8 p.m., 42, Great Dover Street, S.E.1. Communications to Sec., at above address.

TOOTING.—Sec., E. Carnell, 110, Beechcroft Rd., S.W.17. Branch meets Fridays at 8 p.m., at Tooting Adult School, 971, Garratt Lane, S.W.17.

TOTTENHAM.—Secretary, 18, Woodlands Park Rd., N.15. Branch meets Fridays, Room 2, Trades Hall, 7, Bruce Grove, Discussion after branch business. Public invited.

WALTHAMSTOW.—Sec. S. E. Williams, 64, Bloxham-rd., Leyton, E.10. Branch meets at Workmen's Hall, High-st., every Monday.

WATFORD.—A. Lawson, Sec., 107, Kensington-avenue, Watford. Branch meets Mondays at 8.30 p.m. at Secretary's address.

WEST HAM.—Branch meets Thursdays at 8 p.m. at 167, Romford-rd., Stratford. Sec., P. Hallard, 22, Colegrave-rd., Stratford, E.

WOOD GREEN.—All communications to Sec., F. W. Godfrey, 71, Falkland Road, N.8. Branch meets 2nd and 4th Monday in month at 242, High Road, 8.30 p.m.

WOOLWICH.—Communications to Secretary at Head Office.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN.

OBJECT.—The establishment of a system of society based upon the common ownership and democratic control of the means and instruments for producing and distributing wealth by and in the interests of the whole community.

DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great HOLDS— Britain

That society as at present constituted is based upon the ownership of the means of living (i.e., lands, factories, railways, etc.) by the capitalist or master class, and the consequent enslavement of the working class by whose labour alone wealth is produced.

That in society, therefore, there is an antagonism of interests, manifesting itself as a class struggle, between those who possess but do not produce and those who produce but do not possess.

That this antagonism can be abolished only by the emancipation of the working class from the domination of the master class, by the conversion into the common property of society of the means of production and distribution, and their democratic control by the whole people.

That as in the order of social evolution the working class is the last class to achieve its freedom, the emancipation of the working class will involve the emancipation of all mankind, without distinction of race or sex.

That this emancipation must be the work of the working class itself.

That as the machinery of government, including the armed forces of the nation, exists only to conserve the monopoly by the capitalist class of the wealth taken from the workers, the working class must organise consciously and politically for the conquest of the powers of government, national and local, in order that this machinery, including these forces, may be converted from an instrument of oppression into the agent of emancipation and the overthrow of privilege, aristocratic and plutocratic.

That as political parties are but the expression of class interests, and as the interest of the working class is diametrically opposed to the interests of all sections of the master class, the party seeking working-class emancipation must be hostile to every other party.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain, therefore, enters the field of political action determined to wage war against all other political parties, whether alleged labour or avowedly capitalist, and calls upon the members of the working class of this country to muster under its banner to the end that a speedy termination may be wrought to the system which deprives them of the fruits of their labour, and that poverty may give place to comfort, privilege to equality, and slavery to freedom.

Those agreeing with the above principles and desiring enrolment in the Party should apply for membership form to secretary of nearest branch or at Head Office.

THE Socialist Standard

The Official Organ of **THE SOCIALIST PARTY** of Great Britain.

No. 304. Vol. 26.]

LONDON, DECEMBER, 1929.

[MONTHLY, TWOPENCE.]

“LABOUR” FAILS, WHY NOT TRY SOCIALISM?

Had the Labour Government been prepared with schemes dealing effectively with unemployment they could not have set the stage and billed Mr. Thomas' performance with greater assurance than they did for the drab fiasco that resulted.

All parties criticise his schemes for their inadequacy. His own party were not the least dissatisfied and critical. The “New Leader” pretended to see in his refusal to call himself a Socialist the real cause of his failure. That journal said (8th November):

The fault is not his entirely. Upon the Cabinet itself rests a very considerable measure of responsibility. Where, for instance, is the National Economic Committee of which such a great feature was made in “Labour and the Nation”? Where is the Employment and Development Board which was to take a lead in scientifically developing the National estate? Where are there signs of the harnessing to the State of the great Civil Servants who had such invaluable experience of mobilising the nation's resources during the war?

But provided all this is remedied, Mr. Thomas must still fail unless he tackles the problem far more fundamentally than there is any indication of his doing at present.

Because unemployment is fundamentally necessary to capitalism it must of necessity be dealt with fundamentally. Because it is the working-class that suffers from unemployment, only that class can deal with it fundamentally.

Because Mr. Thomas has no mandate from the workers to interfere with the basis of capitalism he can only attempt to palliate the evil. What is the difference between him and his friends of the “New Leader”? Merely a difference in the kind and the number of reforms.

Mr. Thomas, in order to pose as the friend of the unemployed, provides work for some of them out of the arrears of his predecessors in office. A system of fast and heavy motor traffic has been allowed to grow up on roads totally unsuited for it. The ever-mounting total of casualties has already forced Governments to act, but in a sluggish and inadequate fashion. Mr. Thomas has made a virtue of necessity; more than half the work he is so ingeniously (?) providing would have been done years ago but that capitalists and capitalist governments lack foresight and directive ability—the very qualities they boast of possessing.

“Mr. Thomas,” says the “New Leader,” “during the next few months may put some 50,000 people into employment—but at the same time rationalisation is putting others out of employment with increasing rapidity. Poor Mr. Thomas is like a man pouring water into a pail without a bottom.”

This is putting it mildly. Labour-saving machinery, new methods and rationalisation are all utilised in Mr. Thomas' schemes, as well as the world over. Their effect is such that all the reforms conceived by the I.L.P., plus the good will of the capitalists—if that were possible—could not prevent unemployment increasing. What of other reforms? A Minimum Wage! Capitalists will always pay that and no more without compulsion. Increase the Dole! Then it is still a dole and must remain inadequate. Children's Allowances! On top of present wages? Not at all likely while capitalists pay wages.

These and many other reforms advocated by the I.L.P. have been exposed in the columns of the SOCIALIST STANDARD. Careful examination by the workers would prove their worthlessness. Those who advocate them do so with the ultimate object of doing what Mr. Thomas is doing: pouring water into a pail with no bottom, for a Minister's salary and a place in the limelight.

The "Daily News" (14/11/29), commenting on Mr. Thomas' failure, says:

What the vast mass of the electors are thinking about all the time, however they may vote and however they may pray, is how they are to get work, how they are to keep it, or how they are to bear the burdens, which in one form or another the existence of a vast army of unemployed people imposes upon them.

What is the natural deduction? That the vast mass of the workers are deeply concerned in a solution of unemployment. Not merely in some temporary expedient that will tide them over a winter, or bring the figures back to pre-war level. The need of the capitalist class is a normal army of unemployed, to drive their wage-slaves in the mad race for markets through the cheapening of commodities. The need of the workers is release from the nightmare of unemployment and assurance of the necessities of life.

Capitalism in its competitive struggle shortens the labour-time required to produce all commodities; with the twin results of increasing unemployment and perpetual surfeiting of markets.

But unemployment is only one of the evils of modern society. Alongside it is a shortage, throughout the working-class, of all those things necessary to human well-being: houses, clothes, pure food, time and opportunities for recreation and enjoyment, etc.

This is the greatest contradiction in the history of human society. The vast mass of the people are in perpetual anxiety about their necessities of life, or actually deprived of them. Yet millions all over the world are forced to remain idle and unprovided for when their labour, applied to the nature-given materials, could more than supply all needs.

It is no wonder that Mr. Thomas has failed. No one man, no government can remove, or even permanently remedy, unemployment. The problem is an indication of the underlying poverty and insecurity of the whole working-class. All are affected. The

call for a conference of parties can only result in more water being poured into a pail without a bottom.

As all are affected, all must interest themselves. The need is great. It is for a working-class movement, intelligent, organized, and consciously directed towards controlling governmental powers, that the means of life may be owned by the people and controlled by them. Only by this means can unemployment be removed and only by the working class can it be achieved. F.F.

GOOD NEWS FROM AMERICA.

A NEW SOCIALIST PAPER.

Our American Comrades of the Socialist Educational Society published in November the first number of their monthly journal, "The Socialist."

We welcome this valuable addition to the forces of socialist propaganda and urge readers who wish to be informed on developments in the U.S.A. to become regular subscribers. "The Socialist" can be obtained from the publishers at 35, West 20th Street, New York City, or from this office. Subscription rates, 1 dollar, or 4s. 0d. per annum post free. Single copies 10 cents, or 3d. Bundle rates given on application.

PARLIAMENTARY FUND.

It is intended to continue the Parliamentary Fund opened prior to the last General Election, and subscriptions are invited from all who wish to bring nearer the time when we can run Socialist candidates at Parliamentary contests.

CORRECTIONS.

We regret that two errors were allowed to appear in the answer to a correspondent about "Unemployment and the Printing Trades" in the November "S.S."

In line 3 of the second paragraph, column one, page 39, "when" should read "than." In line 2, last paragraph in column two, "article" should read "critic." ED. COMM.

MEETING.

A meeting will be held at Stratford Town Hall on January 12th, 1930, at 7.30 p.m. Admission free. Questions and discussion. All invited.

THE DELUSIONS OF A CRITIC.

An individual of any standing cannot with impunity set out a criticism of a subject such as Physics, Biology, or Chemistry, without the necessary qualifications for the task. Among the defenders of Capitalism this same disqualification does not appear to matter, providing the subject to be criticised is Socialism. In the "Nineteenth Century and After," a 3s. publication, a Lieut.-Col. Stewart Murray writes in two monthly issues (August and September) upon what he terms "Socialism." If we are to accept his own statements as evidence he is little acquainted with the subject he sets out to criticise. As a sort of apologetic preliminary we are told that:—"Capitalism, or private enterprise, or self interest, or whatever name we please to give the system or right of private property, has done, and is still doing, wonders for Labour." It has enabled Labour to "live and multiply," and whilst so doing, "to improve its standard of life." It has enabled "manual labourers" to obtain an ever-increasing share of the ever-increasing value of production, "and to become Capitalists themselves in vast and ever-increasing numbers." So says this defender of Capitalism. Truly the Capitalist is a Capitalist solely for the benefit of the Worker—and yet, despite this philanthropic sacrifice, we read on the following page that:—"The truth is that Labour is discontented to-day . . . because human nature is such that man is never satisfied." How sad to reflect! Labour dissatisfied with its slums, adulterated scraps and offal, overwork and enforced idleness, misery galore—ungrateful Labour! The Capitalist Class, being of course of a different nature, are perfectly contented with things. Why shouldn't they be? Next we learn that it has been to most people a "great surprise" that 8,000,000 electors have "voted Socialist." You must be careful not to jump to conclusions, because, on the next line, we read that:—"not one in a hundred of them, and probably not one in ten, properly understood what they were voting for, or could have even rightly defined Socialism if they were asked." In order to explain what Socialism is, "properly understood," our critic, who claims to have carried on for 30 years discussions with "Socialists of all sorts and

of all camps,"—then defines it. It is, he says, "the nationalisation of all the means of production, exchange, and distribution." According to this definition Capitalist industry is Socialism if it is State or Government controlled as it was until recently by a Labour Administration in Australia, or as it is here in the Post Office and the Municipalities. Having thus assumed that State Capitalism is Socialism, and that those who voted for the State Capitalist programme of the Labour Party are Socialists, we are prepared for what our critic wants to pass off as Socialism. How many, he says, "would have voted Socialist if they had properly realised it?" Let Lt.-Colonel Stewart Murray make his horrifying revelation thus:

"Ask a Socialist to describe in detail the working of a real complete Socialist State, and you will find that he will very soon land himself in the most hopelessly insurmountable difficulties. No one can tell you, for example, if Socialism in power should or will allow wages of ability or not, or only equal remuneration for all work; nor how Socialism is going to nationalise 'all the means of production, exchange, and distribution'; nor how it is to avoid the conscription of labour and telling everybody off not to do the work they wish to do, but to whatever sort of work the State orders them to do; or how it is to avoid the greatest and most hopeless tyranny ever seen in the world as in Russia." It is a reasonable assumption that our critic knows as much, and no more, about Russia, than he gives evidence of knowing about Socialism. He doesn't even know that in Russia, where he says "Socialism has had absolutely free scope," the bulk of the population are peasants, whilst the industrial workers work for wages as in this country. Wages are the price of labour-power, whether that labour-power is employed by the Capitalist State or by a private employer. The Working Class are compelled to sell that labour-power, their only possession, to a non-producing class who own society's means of life, and who consequently can retain much of the product of the workers' labour. Socialism means the abolition of classes, wage payers, wage receivers, nations, states and tyrannies. It means, in short, a system of society in which the commonly-owned and commonly-controlled means of social living would make such things absurd and unnecessary. A statement of Stalin's

makes it clear that these things, classes, wages, exploitation, do exist in Russia.

He says in his book "Leninism": When Lenin analysed the nature of State Capitalism, he was thinking mainly of concessions. Well, then, let us consider these concessions, and consider whether two classes are represented in the work of production. Yes, certainly, two classes are represented here; the class of the Capitalists, the concessionaires, who are exploiters, and who for the time being own the means of production, and the class of the proletarians, who are exploited by the concessionaires. Here, obviously, we have nothing to do with Socialism. ("Leninism," page 388.)

To make his criticism appear intellectually deep and, above all, destructive of Marx's teachings, Stewart Murray pretends to a wide knowledge of what he terms the views of various groups in the Labour Party. So different are these views, he says:—"that it is difficult to find any important points on which they agree, except a common allegiance to Karl Marx's antiquated exposition of Socialism." Poor old Marx—strange why so many should be trying to-day to show that his exposition of Socialism is antiquated. This brainy defender of Capitalism marshals a number of what he seems to think are brand new objections. These he declares Marx overlooked. They include "Racial differences"; "Psychological attributes"; "Inequalities, mental and physical, of men at birth"; heredity; evolution; and production and distribution. Surely a formidable lot—but only to those unacquainted with the writings of Marx. Possibly one paragraph in an early work of Marx and Engels (The Communist Manifesto) summarises the whole lot. There Marx says:—"Does it require deep intuition to comprehend that man's ideas, views and conceptions, in one word, man's consciousness, changes with every change in the conditions of his material existence, in his social relations and in his social life?" Did racial differences prevent Japan from becoming a Capitalist country with a Western culture and a constitution developed on lines similar to that adopted by all Capitalist countries in their course of development? Does not the development of India and China show like tendencies? Regarding national differences, even the Capitalist League of Nations does not consider these of any importance where their own problems are concerned. Mental and physical inequalities at birth, we are told, "produce economic inequalities." If this were so, then we should expect to find

the present economic classes at every stage in society. Any student of the subject could tell our critic that the greatest part of the time of man's existence upon the earth has been lived in communities in which classes and private property were unknown. Biologically a Capitalist is born the same as a Worker. Says Marx:—

One thing, however, is clear: nature does not produce on the one side owners of money or commodities, and on the other men possessing nothing but their own labour power. The relation has no natural basis, neither is its social basis one that is common to all historical periods. It is clearly the result of a past historical development, the product of many economical revolutions, of the extinction of a whole series of older forms of social production. ("Capital," pp. 147, 148.)

To-day any child or imbecile could be the recipient of Rent, Interest, or Profit, providing he or she owned the legal right to the particular form of property. The less said about the reward meted out to superior mental attainments under Capitalism the better. Compare the rewards of a Rothschild and a Schubert, General Booth and Karl Marx, Crompton and Carnegie. Which wins through to-day, money grabbing mediocrity, or painstaking, scientific enquiry and efforts that will benefit posterity? Says this would-be critic:—"The Marxian hypothesis, even in its most evolutionary forms, demands a change in human nature for any possibility of success. But the elements of human nature do not change." When we reach the opposite page we are told that the conditions of one age are fallacious if used dogmatically as data for those of another. "The Marxists forget this when they cite as authoritative the economic theory or speculation formulated by Marx in the middle of last century, since which period, so many and so great changes have occurred." This reminds us of the old-time song, "'E dunno where 'e are." Let us, in conclusion, again quote Marx, and note how his masterly summary meets practically every objection raised:—"No social order ever disappears before all the productive forces for which there is room in it have been developed; and new, higher relations of production never appear before the material conditions of their existence have matured in the womb of the old society. Therefore, mankind always takes up only such problems as it can solve; since, looking at the matter more closely, we will always find that the problem itself arises only when the material conditions for its solution

already exist or are at least in the process of formation." (Critique of Political Economy, pages 11-13.) Let the Capitalist apologists proclaim the death of Socialism from the turrets of their cowards' castles. When the Workers in any numbers become acquainted with Socialist principles efforts to rebut scientific Socialist teachings will be impotent.

MAC.

A COMMUNIST SUMS UP THE COMMUNIST PARTY.

Indeed, what with the anxiety of the "Rights" to prove themselves to be "Left," the Party leadership is in such a state of confusion that one almost stands aghast at the situation. I will illustrate the criticism. First examine the way in which the anti-war question is being handled, and especially the Russo-Chinese crisis.

In *Workers' Life* of August 30th, headlines of a splash article on the Russo-Chinese crisis proclaim: "Hostilities have broken out." It goes on to tell that we are on the brink of world war. We must "Organise demonstrations and strikes against the war-makers' Government." The first paragraph of the article qualifies the headlines. The second and third paragraphs hold America responsible as the devil behind the Chinese Government. The fourth tells us that the Labour Government is assisting the Border States to prepare for war. But it does not say a word as to what the Labour Government is doing in relation to the Russo-Chinese war. How shall we get the British workers to strike against the Labour Government because America is pushing the Chinese on to war in Manchuria is not explained to us at all.

Then, please turn up the next issue of *Workers' Life*, September 6th, and it will be found that the Russo-Chinese crisis has vanished into thin air and nobody knows why. There is no news of the strike we were to call the previous week; no news of the world conflagration that was overwhelming us. This also has vanished. Surely we ought to have been told how this happened. But by September 13th the Russo-Chinese crisis quietly re-appears.

Can we hope to win influence amongst the workers so long as the most serious questions are treated in such an irresponsible manner? The Party appears to be wildly gesticulating and nothing happens, except that we continue to report decline in sales of Party papers. Is it surprising? (J. T. Murphy, in the *Communist Review*, November.)

Saturday Evening Meetings

at

42, GREAT DOYER STREET, S.E.1.

December 7th.	...	Play-reading.
" 14th.	...	Open Discussion.
" 28th.	...	Social.

ANOTHER LIFE OF MARX.

(Continued from October.)

I have now given sufficient information to enable the reader to judge of the biased and unreliable nature of Ruhle's "Life of Marx." The last few pages of the book give us the apparent reason for this attempt to blacken the personal character of Marx. All through the book the writer is endeavouring to show (but without sound evidence) that Marx was a very clever thinker—but allowed his personal feelings to override his judgment. The author is compelled to admit time after time that Marx's judgments were ultimately sound, as witness quotations given. But he persists all through the book in trying to give the reader this impression of uncertainty. Why? Here is the explanation:—

Marxism, being primarily called upon to stir up the proletarian masses, to make them collect their forces, and to lead them on to the battlefield, must necessarily display itself at the outset in a guise which would encourage optimism; in a guise which, by representing historical evolution as the guarantee of the liberation of mankind, would make the workers believe in their own mission. To gain headway, it must relentlessly clear out of the path all rationalistic and utopian systems of Socialism, and must inexorably proceed on its own course. To-day, when its work is finished, Marxism begins to assume a new aspect. In our own time, not merely can Marxism occasionally recur to the systems of the Utopists and the rationalists; it is directly faced in this direction by the practical demands of the day by the growing claims for positive achievements in the class struggle. (p. 396.) (Italics ours.)

There you have it. Marxism was all right in the past, but now times have changed—Labour rules!—and we can indulge in wars, and all the rest of the reformer's stock-in-trade. Actually, of course, there has been no change, and practical affairs of the day demand a still stricter adherence to the basic principles taught by Marx unless the workers are to flounder in the morass of Labourism for another century.

Mr. Ruhle, however, in branding Marx as a neurotic, is really making a special plea for himself and his friends. On the last page of the book he writes:—

The main thing was the work which had to be done; the qualities of the doer mattered little. Or, rather, the doer of the work which had to be done, had to be spurred to his task by an impetus such as could only be furnished by the neurosis from which Marx suffered! To-day, we have different problems to solve, and they must

be solved by highly qualified persons who have freed themselves from neurosis; must be solved by champions of the class struggle who approach the undertaking with a keen sense of responsibility, an awakened consciousness, and a strongly developed community feeling. (p. 397.)

Now we begin to see light. We must forget Marx's view, that the workers must accomplish their own emancipation, and put our trust in nice, kind, gentlemanly people like Ruhle and MacDonald, and the rest of the silk-hatted, frock-coated crowd.

It will be observed that I am now suffering from "stomach-ache" and getting personal. Ruhle's attack on Marx is a fitting reflection of the former's practical career. A disciple of Alfred Adler, of Vienna, he belonged to the German Social Democratic Party and voted with Liebnicht against the war in 1914. In the German post-war upheaval he took a leading part and was a member of the Council of Workers and Soldiers. Now he is neither in the German S.D.P. nor in the Communist Party, but is a kind of anarchist and has written books on "The Soul of the Proletarian Child," and similar topics. Hence his kindly feelings towards Lassalle and Bakunin.

In one respect, however, this book can certainly be recommended. It contains voluminous extracts from some of the earlier and less known writings of Marx. These extracts reveal how early Marx obtained a clear grasp of the driving force in history.

Marx's approach to Socialism was from the philosophical side. His early studies were concerned mainly with law and philosophy. His father wished to make of him a lawyer, but philosophy had a greater appeal at the beginning and ultimately he obtained a degree as Doctor of Philosophy, though he did not make use of it.

While working on the "New Rhenish Gazette," Marx found his ignorance of economics constantly placing him in difficulties when dealing with questions of the day. When that paper was suppressed he immediately set about making up for the deficiency. In 1843 he did a tremendous amount of reading in history and economics, the first fruits of which was an article in the French and German Year Book entitled "Introduction to a Critique of the Hegelian Philosophy of Right." The following extracts give an idea of his early progress towards Socialist knowledge (at the time he was only 25 years old):—

Man makes religion; religion does not make man. Religion, indeed, is the self-consciousness

and the self-feeling of the man who either has not yet found himself, or else (having found himself) has lost himself once more. But man is not an abstract being, squatting down somewhere outside the world. Man is the world of men, the State, society. This state, this society, produce religion, produce a perverted world consciousness, because they are a perverted world. Religion is the generalised theory of this world, its encyclopædic compend, its logic in a popular form. . . . The fight against religion is, therefore, a direct campaign against the world whose spiritual aroma is religion.

Religion is the sigh of the oppressed creature, the feelings of a heartless world, just as it is the spirit of unspiritual conditions. It is the opium of the people.

Thus the criticism of heaven is transformed into a criticism of earth, the criticism of religion into a criticism of law, the criticism of theology into a criticism of politics. (pp. 57 and 58.)

Thus early in his mental development Marx saw in religion an attempt on the part of the oppressed to escape from the troubles that afflicted them in the world of practical affairs. He also saw that the solution lay, not in theological disputations, not in new philosophical views, but in changing the constitution of society:—

The criticism of religion ends with the doctrine that man is the highest being for man; it ends, that is to say, with the categorical imperative that all conditions must be revolutionised in which man is a debased, an enslaved, an abandoned, a contemptible being. . . . a radical is one who cuts at the roots of things.

A radical revolution, the general emancipation of mankind, is not a Utopian dream for Germany; what is Utopian is the idea of a partial, an exclusively political revolution, which would leave the pillars of the house standing.

What, then, are the practical possibilities of German emancipation? Here is the answer. They are to be found in the formation of a class with radical chains, a class of civil society which is not a class of civil society; of an estate which is the dissolution of all estates; of a sphere which is endowed with a universal character by the universality of its sufferings; one which does not lay claim to any particular rights, the reason being that it does not suffer any one specific injustice, but suffers injustice unqualified; one which can no longer put forward a historically grounded title, but only a general human title; one which is not in any sort of one-sided opposition to the consequences, but only in general opposition to the presuppositions of the German political system; and, finally, a sphere which cannot emancipate itself, without emancipating itself from all the other spheres of society—one which, in a word, has been completely deprived of its human privileges, so that it can only regain itself by fully regaining these human privileges. This dissolution of society as a particular estate is—the proletariat.

If the proletariat herald the dissolution of the world order as hitherto extant, it is merely,

thereby, expressing the mystery of its own existence, for it is the actual dissolution of this previous world order. (p. 60.)

In the above extracts we have a remarkably clear foreshadowing of Marx's final conclusions as embodied in his materialist conception of history and theory of surplus value which together form the foundations of scientific Socialism. And it is a remarkably clear and logical contribution from one so youthful considering the range of the subject and the state of philosophical, historical and economic science at the time he was writing.

I would like to give many more extracts from these earlier works of Marx, but, unfortunately, they would lengthen out this review too much. I must therefore refer anyone who wishes to watch the mental development of Marx to the book itself, in which there is a great deal of useful quotations from these early writings.

There are one or two further points, however, I must mention before concluding.

On page 198 "Hic Rhodus, hic salta!" is translated as "Here is the Rose; dance here!" Surely this really refers to the traveller in one of the ancient classical tales, who, returning home after considerable wanderings, boasted to his friends of his wonderful achievements; among others that while at Rhodes he saw a tremendous statue with gigantic legs spread far apart, and that he had leaped from one of the feet to the other. His friends, already sickened by his tall stories, and wishing to "take down" the boaster, cried, "Here is Rhodes, now leap," or, in other words—"pretend this is Rhodes, now show us how you can jump."

On page 199, writing of Engels, Ruhle says he "unselfishly devoted his evenings, year after year, when the day's work was over, to writing the necessary articles for the 'New York Tribune.'" In a review of a previous book on Marx by Ryazanoff we gave our reasons for contesting this view, and we must refer the reader to that review for a full statement. Engels certainly helped Marx by putting his articles into English at a time when Marx had not yet acquired a complete command of English, and he also wrote some of the articles dealing with military matters, but that is all. Ruhle's appetite for detraction leads him to make these sweeping statements where opportunity offers.

We cannot commend the translators for

the bibliography at the end. They seem more concerned with their own translations than with giving the reader a list of Marx's writings that are accessible to those who can only read English, e.g., "Value, Price and Profit," "Introduction to the Critique of Political Economy," "Lord Palmerston," "The Eastern Question," "Class Struggles in France," etc.

Ruhle, in his book, has taken his evidence of Marx's personal character from those who were his bitter enemies, and who knew comparatively little of Marx's private life. Let me give the evidence of one who knew Marx for the greater part of his life and one who also suffered greatly and gave the whole of his life work—apart from the time necessary to earn a living—to the struggle for working class freedom. I refer to Frederick Lessner. Liebnicht's tribute to Marx is well known, but Ruhle is pleased to look upon Liebnicht with the eye of suspicion. No one, however, has yet presumed to throw any mud at Lessner. Here is an extract from his "Recollections of an Old Communist," with which I very fittingly close this review:—

Marx was, as are all truly great men, free from conceit, and appreciated every genuine striving, every opinion based on independent thinking. . . . as already mentioned, he was always eager to hear the opinion of the simplest working man on the labour movement. Thus he would often come to me in the afternoon, fetch me for a walk, and talk about all sorts of matters. . . . Generally he was an excellent companion, who extremely attracted, one might say, charmed, everybody that came in touch with him. His humour was irrepressible; his laugh a very hearty one. . . .

Some comrades proposed to erect a monument to him. But no monument could be of finer foundation than his teachings, his actions, and his struggles, which are engraved now into the hearts and heads of millions of workers for ever.

GILMAC.

SHEFFIELD.

A meeting will be held at the A.E.U. Institute (Library), Stanley Street, on Friday, December 13th, at 7.30 p.m. A short address on the S.P.G.B. will be followed by questions and discussion. Admission free. All invited.

 Send your TINFOIL to the General Secretary at the Head Office—It will help to Raise Funds.

OFFICIAL NOTICE.

All communications for the Executive Committee, Subscriptions for the SOCIALIST STANDARD, Articles, and Correspondence submitted for insertion therein, should be addressed—The Socialist Party of Great Britain, 42, Great Dover Street, London, S.E.1, to whom Money Orders should be made payable.

The meetings of the Executive Committee are held at the Head Office, every Tuesday, at 7.30 p.m.

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTIONS.

Twelve Months, post free.. .. 2s. 6d.
Six Months, post free 1s. 3d.

The Socialist Standard,

DEC.,



1929

RUSSIA:**A DANGEROUS DELUSION.**

When in 1921 the Bolsheviks introduced their "New Economic Policy," they stated plainly what they were doing and why they had no alternative. Their early hopes of the immediate establishment of socialism in the advanced capitalist countries had been shown to be illusory, and it was necessary for Russia to develop on capitalist lines. The Bolsheviks consciously adopted the policy described by the late Leonid Krassin as "nationalisation," or "state capitalism." (See report of lecture by Krassin reproduced in "Labour Monthly," January 16th, 1922.)

They saw that Russian industry could be developed on no other basis than a capitalist basis, and in respect of a large area of industry and transport they preferred state capitalism to private capitalism.

The Socialist Party does not support nationalisation or state capitalism in this country, because that policy is contrary to working-class interests, and is not in this country a step towards Socialism. Russian conditions are different. Russia was, and is, very backward industrially, and the problems there are not those which face the workers in the more advanced countries. We have therefore no criticism to

offer of the general policy of hastening capitalist development in Russia. No other policy is practicable. What criticisms we offer relate to methods of applying that policy and to the policy of suppression.

We do, however, strongly protest against the attempts to misrepresent Russia as being run on socialist lines. It is untrue, and such misrepresentation makes more difficult the work of preaching Socialism. Russia presents, and will continue to present, in spite of any good intentions of its rulers, the conflicts and evils normal to the capitalist system. Nothing but harm to the Socialist movement can come from propaganda which misrepresents the very real achievements of the Bolsheviks by calling them the building up of Socialism. Socialism—the common ownership of the means of production and distribution—is not to be found in Russia any more than in Great Britain or the U.S.A.

Sometimes this misleading propaganda is the work of persons who have never troubled to understand what capitalism is. Calling themselves Communists, they merely apply to Russia the confusing propaganda used by the Labour Party in this country. They support State capitalism and call it Socialism because they know no better and really believe that the change from private capitalism to State control of capitalist industry represents a fundamental change. Others who associate themselves with this confusion do know better and are guilty of deliberate falsehood.

We find Scott Nearing, a prominent American Communist, writing in the "New Masses" (October), about Russia, and saying: "Profiteering has been largely eliminated. Exploitation has been wiped out."

It will be noticed that Scott Nearing uses the loose and undefined term "profiteering" instead of "profit making," and implies that the "profiteering" which has not yet been eliminated is not "exploitation." We say that such misleading statements from Scott Nearing can only result from a deliberate intention to deceive.

The "Trade Union Bulletin" (August-September, 1929) issued by the U.S.S.R. Central Council of Trade Unions, Labour Palace, Solianka 12, Moscow, describes the plans for large State farms under the title "Socialistic Reconstruction of Rural Economy." In fact this is simply an application of State capitalism to Russian agriculture.

The "Sunday Worker" on September 15th made the deliberately false statement that "All the products of (Russian) industry go to the workers and peasants," and asked, "What do they want parasites for?"

When it was pointed out to the editor that the State industries are largely financed by means of loans and that the receivers of interest are "parasites," the editor replied with the evasive and untrue statements, which follow:—

The loans which are being raised to finance the Five-Year Plan are largely subscribed by Russian workers and peasants. These, using their own money to build their own Socialist state, can hardly be parasites—unless they are to be regarded as parasites upon themselves. There are also non-working-class investors, who would be glad to live on the interest from these loans, and become parasites. But the laws of the Soviet Union prevent that. These people cannot acquire land or any of the means of production which would enable them to exploit workers. They are not allowed to be parasites. (Sunday Worker, Sept. 22nd.)

Such arguments from a so-called Socialist paper are pitiful. To suggest that Russians calling themselves "workers and peasants" cannot be "parasites on themselves," is equivalent to saying that there cannot be parasites in England because persons calling themselves "English" cannot be parasites on themselves. The simple truth is that a minority of persons in England have large investments and draw incomes from them; the majority do not possess such investments. So also in Russia, a wealthy minority having relatively large incomes from various sources, from salaries, from legal and illegal trading, from farming, and from investments, are able to accumulate capital for further use in legitimate and illegitimate business, or for investment in State loans. They draw property incomes from these investments and are "parasites."

To say that those who receive incomes from investment in Russia cannot "become parasites" (they are that already) because they are prevented from acquiring land or other means of production, is like saying that those English capitalists who invest in Government loans and live on the proceeds without buying land or other means of production are not "parasites," but that their fellow investors who derive similar property incomes from investment in farming or other productive concerns, are "parasites."

Inequality of incomes and of property in Russia is great and growing, although less than in this country. According to figures from official Russian sources given in his book, "Three Months in Russia," by W. J. Brown, M.P., the pay in the Russian Civil Service rises, according to grade, from less than £5 a month up to £45 a month (see pages 113 & 114). Mr. Brown, it may be remarked, is more than sympathetic to the Bolsheviks, and is in fact highly gratified because the inequality of pay in Russia is less than elsewhere.

A correspondent of the "Manchester Guardian" (Oct. 21st) states that the pay of engineering experts is as high as £1,750, £2,500 and even £3,500 a year. The average wage of manual workers, on the other hand, is 73 roubles a month, or less than £90 a year. (See "Ministry of Labour Gazette," October, for figures from Russian official sources.)

According to the Soviet Union Year Book, 1929, out of a population of 140 millions, the number of persons with deposits in the Savings Banks on October 1st, 1928, was only 3,825,900, the average deposit being 82 roubles (see page 449). (A rouble is worth about 2s.)

The loans being issued at high rates of interest in connection with the Five Year Economic Plan are comparable in amount and in kind with the annual investments of capital in the rest of the capitalist countries.

The Russian State Debt stands now at about 2,100 million roubles (about £210 million). Interest ranges up to as much as 12 per cent. on some of the issues. It is planned to increase the debt under the Five Year Economic Plan by borrowing another 6,000 million roubles (£600 million) in five years (see *Bank for Russian Trade Review*, June, 1929). Other fields of capital investment are the co-operatives and the concession companies. The profits on the concessions are extraordinarily high.

The existence of a class of large investors is clearly shown by the relative amounts of State lottery loans and non-lottery loans. On page 406 of the "Soviet Union Year Book," it is stated that "Soviet State loans that are intended to be placed among small investors are lottery loans, since these are more attractive to the small subscribers."

On pages 408 and 409 are details of the various loans. It will be seen that the

total of non-lottery issues is more than four times as great as the lottery loans—i.e., the small investors' loans.

From these particulars it will be seen that Russia is making encouraging progress along the road of capitalist industry. It is impossible for Russia yet to progress on any other basis than capitalism. But Communists who pretend that it is socialism are deliberately or unknowingly propagating a falsehood and hindering the work for socialism.

THE I.L.P. IN PARLIAMENT.

It is argued on behalf of the I.L.P. that their propaganda methods are justified by their success. As proof of this they point to a relatively large membership and to the fact that more than 200 of their members are Labour Party M.P.'s. How hollow is this success can be seen from the inability of the I.L.P. to control its members in the House of Commons. Mr. Maxton, Chairman of the I.L.P., criticised the Labour Government's Unemployment Insurance Bill, and threatened to oppose its second reading. The prompt result, as reported in the *Daily Herald* of November 19th, was that,

between 50 and 60 I.L.P. M.P.s last night signed a memorial repudiating the right of the I.L.P. officials to speak on their behalf.

Moreover, Mr. W. Leach, M.P., who prepared the memorial and is himself an I.L.P. member, explained that he had not approached any of the 80 holders of offices in the Government, and could have obtained many other signatures (apart from the 80 referred to) if he had had more time to approach Labour M.P.'s not immediately available. (*Daily Herald*, 20th November.)

The following day, November 19th, Mr. Maxton stated his case against the Government's Bill at a meeting of the Parliamentary Labour Party. The *Daily Herald* reports that he received the support of only half a dozen M.P.'s (*Daily Herald*, 20th November); this, although over 200 of them are members of his party, the I.L.P.

The same evening he stated his case again at a meeting of the I.L.P. M.P.'s, but was turned down by 41 votes to 14 (*Daily Herald*, 20th November).

On November 20th, Mr. Maxton and his

supporters put their names to an amendment, as follows:—

This House records its profound regret that the Bill, while abolishing the fourth statutory condition for the receipt of benefit, imposes a new condition, which still leaves the burden of proof of his search for work on the applicant for benefit; which does not provide £1 a week for the adult unemployed man, 10s. for his wife, and 5s. for each dependent child, but leaves young persons inadequately provided for; and which fails to restore the waiting period of three days as in the Act of 1924.

It will be noticed that the demand of the "rebels" differs little from the offer of the Government. They only ask for 2s. more per week for an unemployed man, and are presumably of the opinion that £1 a week is enough.

Mr. P. C. Hoffmann, one of the 33 signatories (32 Labour M.P.'s and one Independent, Mr. Scrymgeour), explained to a *Herald* correspondent that "if the motion were one for the rejection of the Bill, or if it were a vote of censure on the Government, I should have nothing to do with it."

That many others of the 33 were in the same boat and were counting on the amendment never going to a division is shown by the fact that 12 of the signatories withdrew their names next day (see *Herald*, 23rd November). Finally they all voted for the Government Bill. What is obvious is that the members of the I.L.P. who have scrambled into Parliament on the non-Socialist votes of Labour Party supporters are not controlled or controllable by the I.L.P. Elected on the Labour Party's non-Socialist programme and dependent on the machinery and on the financial support of that party and of the trade unions, these M.P.'s are powerless to work for Socialism. H.

SOUTHWARK BRANCH.

In order to extend the activities of the Party in S.E. London, the Clerkenwell and Camberwell Branches have united to form the above branch.

The new branch meets at 42, Great Dover Street on Friday evenings at 8.30, and all those in the district who agree with our Object and Declaration of Principles are invited to attend and help forward the work for Socialism.

Membership of the branch will also be open to those who are able to attend Head Office and are living in districts where there is no branch of the Party.

A SOVIET APOLOGIA.

"An Outline of Political Economy." I. Lapidus and K. Ostrovityanov. (Martin Lawrence, 12/6. 546 pages.)

The above volume reminds one very forcibly of the curate's egg. Roughly, half of it is occupied with a summary review of Marx's conclusions concerning Capitalist society generally, and this is done, on the whole, simply, accurately and clearly. The main aim of the book, however, is obviously not the popularisation of Marxism, but the vindication of the claim of the Bolshevik rulers of Russia to be Marxists.

In their introduction the authors state that, "Together with the laws governing the productive relations of Capitalist economy, we shall also study the laws of Soviet economy."

"The peculiar feature of Soviet economy lies in the fact that it is in transition from Capitalism to Socialism." (p. 4.) The attempt to prove this claim takes the form of chapters interspersed among those presenting the Marxian analysis.

For example, after three chapters dealing with value and surplus value, Marx does a rapid fade-out and the limelight is focussed on Lenin, who in 1918 specified the various economic elements in Russia as follows:—

1. Patriarchal, i.e., largely self-sufficing, peasant economy.
2. Petty commodity production (this includes the majority of those peasants who sell grain).
3. Capitalist production.
4. Elements of State Capitalism.
5. Elements of Socialism. (p. 92.)

By State Capitalism Lenin appears to have meant undertakings which were bound to the State by some agreement (such as concessions, leases, trading commissions, etc.) as distinct from undertakings actually run by the State itself.

These latter he classed as "Socialist," and gave as his reasons that "the State is the workers, the leading section of the workers, the advance guard—it is ourselves." (p. 93.)

Somewhat reminiscent of the French kings, "The State? that is me!" This statement of Lenin's is the only evidence which the authors offer throughout their volume to support the claim that the workers of Russia are supplanting Capitalism by Socialism. This claim, however, has been repeatedly exploded in these

columns, most recently in the issues of August and September, 1929.

Once grant their claim and the rest is easy. Surplus-value becomes surplus-product, since the former phrase implies exploitation which cannot be admitted to exist in State industry! Wage-slavery likewise is "non-existent" in the State workshops, although the workers therein are paid wages! Curiously enough these workers "also strive first and foremost to obtain as high a wage as possible." They fail to recognise "the radical difference" between Soviet production and the usual forms of Capitalism. "This explains the existence of standards of output and piece-work payment in Soviet State industry." (p. 132.) (Italics the authors'.)

Apparently the workers in Russia have taken possession of the industries there without knowing it.

In spite of their "Marxism," the authors are not above trotting out the stale Capitalist argument about the necessity for the workers "producing more." Thus (on p. 127) we are told that:—

"Granted an unchanging productivity of labour, the higher the wage the greater will be the expenditure for each commodity turned out by the worker, and the dearer will be the cost of that commodity; and thus the worker himself will have to pay more when purchasing it (thus neutralising the rise in wages)."

The I.L.P. could not beat this!

The authors make no attempt to deny "the facts that the Soviet workers live in greater poverty and on no higher a standard than the workers of the foremost Capitalist countries, and the workers in the State enterprises sometimes live under worse conditions than the workers in private enterprises." (p. 100.)

They do claim, however, that as the workers' productivity rises so does their share of the produce. But their own figures hardly bear out the claim. According to the table shown on page 135 wages rose only 60 per cent. in the two years, 1923-1925 while productivity rose nearly 90 per cent.!

On page 210 we have another glaring example of the authors' fondness for verbal conjuring tricks.

"That part of the surplus product created by the workers in State industry which is appropriated by the merchant capitalist is transformed into surplus-value. Thus exploitation can penetrate partially into Soviet

State industry through the channel of private trade." Thus if the State sells its goods through a merchant the workers are exploited, but not otherwise! Much play is made with the fact that the State builds schools, organises defence, supervises health, etc., oblivious of the fact that Tory, Liberal and Labour Governments do the same thing here.

On the subject of State finance very little is said, but the following paragraph (p. 264) illustrates which class really owns the State industries:—"As to the rate of interest, it is quite high in the U.S.S.R. The rate of interest is higher still on the clandestine exchange. The high rate of interest in the U.S.S.R. is due to the insufficiency of capital, in which there is such a stringency owing to the very rapid growth of Socialist (!) construction." In other words, Russia has a special brand of ultra-revolutionary "Socialism" which is financed by the Capitalist class and is, of course, State Capitalism.

Figures are given showing the rapid recovery of State industry to the low pre-war level which had been lost.

In spite of the overwhelming importance of agriculture we are told (p. 504) that "The productive potentialities of individual peasant agriculture have not yet been exhausted." Rykov declared ("The Present Situation," 1928) that the State organisation of peasant co-operatives "is now the most important task of the party." Yet (p. 529) we learn, "the collective and Government farms put together now produce a total of a little over 2 per cent. of farm products and supply 7 per cent. of the farm products on the market. Their relative strength, as compared with the millions of small farmers, is negligible."

The transition is evidently not from Capitalism to Socialism, but to the former from semi-feudal forms of land tenure. The much-vaunted State planning schemes are but the emergency measures thrust upon the urban population by agrarian upheaval and the industrial collapse brought about by the strain of modern warfare upon a backward nation.

The transition from Capitalism to Socialism can only commence when and where the productive forces have outstripped capitalist ownership. They have not done that yet in Russia.

In conclusion, it may be noted that the "Sunday Worker" review (October 13th)

passes over entirely the points in the above volume of interest to the Socialist worker.

Its chief complaint is that the authors ignore the principal bugbear of the British petty-bourgeois—"the money monopoly"—and uncritical praise is meted out to its "dialectical method." When the Bolsheviks try to explain away what is obvious (namely, the exploitation of the workers in Russia) they make much play with the dialectics, but like Hegel they stand it on its head. They appear to imagine that things can be changed by changing their names. For the last twenty or thirty years we have fought a similar tendency in this country, namely, Fabianism, according to which the Post Office and the tramways are "ours"! Now the Communists are carrying on the same tradition of confusion under new names.

E. B.

PARTY LIBRARY.

We are in need of books, periodicals, and publications of all descriptions, especially Marxian works, for the Party Library at 42, Great Dover Street. Our object is to build a sound reference and lending library for Socialist students.

There must be many older members and sympathisers who have books that are no longer useful to them. We earnestly request their assistance. If we receive more than one copy of the same book, we would—with permission of the sender—sell these for Library funds.

Also, wanted:—Copies of *International Soc. Review* for Nov., 1907; Dec., 1904; May, Sept., Nov., Dec., 1908; Feb., 1906; Jan. to June, 1902.

Social Democrat, July and December, 1904 and any copies for other years.

TO OUR READERS. PLEASE NOTE.

The "Socialist Standard" can be obtained from the following Newsagents—
Coombs & Fancourt, 541, Barking Road, Plaistow.
A. E. Cohen, 297, Barking Road, East Ham.
H. Williams, 36, Barking Road, Canning Town.
C. W. Honess, 63, Stratford Road, Plaistow.
H. S. Bailey, 42, Tower Bridge Road, S.E.
A. Dennington, 518, Romford Road, Manor Park.
Brewster, 155, Barking Road.
W. Villiers, 139, Lower Road, Rotherhithe, S.E.
A. E. Compton, 93, Commercial Rd., Peckham, S.E.

SOCIALISM AND THE GOLD STANDARD.

The following letter has been received from a correspondent:—

38, Bromar Road, S.E.5. 13/11/29.

To the Editor.

Sir and Comrade,

I am surprised at you for bolstering up vested interests by following statement in November issue:—

"Banks receive money on loan and lend it out at a higher rate of interest," and put this forward as an explanation of how banks make their profit.

Mr. McKenna, Chairman, Midland Bank, has for eight years been impressing on us that banks also create money (and get interest on such money).

Since 1913 the total amount of bank deposits has increased by £1,000,000,000, whereas gold has increased by about £7,000,000. Treasury Notes are credit money and need not cost anything.

The only interest due to money system is at most the interest on £130,000,000 of gold which is all there is in Britain, say, £7,000,000 a year. We actually pay £1,000,000,000 or more in interest.

People fail to see through this fraud because Marxians and others approve of a gold standard. See pages 68-102 of "Capital," I Vol. edition; also pages 27-33 of "Value, Price and Profit."

The quickest and best way to establish Socialism and Communism is by money reform and by nationalising money, starting with this bank credit.—Yours fraternally, E. WRIGHT.

Will join the S.P.G.B. when you cease to bolster up present system in this way.

In previous correspondence Mr. Wright urged us to support what he calls "nationalising money," because that is the way to build up "State owned industries" (see October issue). As we are Socialists and are therefore opposed to nationalisation or State industries, we invited Mr. Wright to give us reasons why we should abandon our work for Socialism in order to support State industries. Instead of giving us his reasons, Mr. Wright calmly replaces the words "State owned industries" by the words, "Socialism or Communism," thus showing that his terms mean so little to him that they are interchangeable, and showing that he has not troubled to learn the most elementary Socialist principles. It is plainly impossible to treat seriously the arguments of one who evades every issue by substituting one loosely-used term for another. The present letter merits reply only because Mr. Wright repeats a not uncommon misrepresentation of Marx and of ourselves.

Most of his criticisms originate from his inability to distinguish between statements of fact and statements of principle or policy. Thus he charges us with "bolstering up vested interests" because we allowed to appear in the November issue of the "Socialist Standard" the statement that banks receive money on loan and lend it at a higher rate of interest than they pay to depositors. Mr. Wright reads into this an expression of opinion about the merits or demerits of bankers and the banking system. It is nothing of the kind. It is a statement of facts, and although Mr. Wright lets us know that he disagrees with it, he is careful not to risk telling us which part of the statement he thinks is untrue.

Then he goes on to tell us that Marxians and Marx "approve a gold standard."

Here Mr. Wright pretends to quote authorities for his statement by referring to a passage 34 pages long in Volume I of "Capital." He refrains from giving any specific quotation either from "Capital" or from "Value, Price and Profit," or from any other work of Marx, or from any publication of the Socialist Party to justify his assertion. He does not quote such a passage because no such passage exists. The statement is completely false. Marx did not, and Socialists do not, approve the gold standard or any other currency system. Socialism means a system of society in which goods are produced for the use of the members of society, not for the profit of a privileged class. There will, under Socialism, be no buying and selling, and therefore no need for any currency system, on a gold basis, or of any other kind. That is Socialism, and that is what we work for. Until Mr. Wright takes the trouble to acquaint himself with the objects of the Socialist Party his attempts at criticism will necessarily continue to be irrelevant.

In his postscript, Mr. Wright threatens to join the S.P.G.B. While we cannot prevent him from applying for membership, the decision—fortunately for Socialism—rests in the hands of the Socialist Party.—

ED. COMM.

GET TOGETHER!

Readers of the "Socialist Standard" who desire to be put into communication with other readers in their district are invited to notify the General Secretary, at 42 Great Dover Street, S.E.1.

NEED THE WORKERS UNDERSTAND SOCIALISM?

A correspondent (whose name we unfortunately cannot make out) writes from Stepney, expressing his views on several points and asking for our comments and reply.

The first point relates to the struggle of the workers against wage reductions and for wage increases.

This was fully dealt with in the October "Socialist Standard," to which we would refer him.

Our correspondent is mistaken in thinking that we oppose such struggles.

His second point is the following:—

Seeing that the dominant class, the capitalists, control the Press, which moulds to a great extent opinion (especially in rural districts), the churches, also the cinema, an excellent propaganda weapon, besides other channels of influencing thought. That the workers, despite the rottenness of their conditions, cannot understand "scientific Socialism," will it not be that as capitalist crises occur—the workers—will eventually gravitate to a united organised resistance to their conditions?

This only after bitter struggles, strikes, lock-outs, brutality of the authorities, after such a process the climax will come. On one side will be the workers; on the other, the lackeys of capitalism, managers, high officials, ignorant police, and soldiers, who are kept in mental darkness, but for one thing, obedience. Nothing but violent struggle in my opinion.

What our correspondent overlooks is that while a politically ignorant working class may unite for some purposes they will not unite together and replace Capitalism by Socialism. They may unite to resist a wage reduction, but such resistance, whether successful or not does not bring Socialism. Quite apart from the question of the conquest of power, Socialism as a working system of society is impossible without a Socialist working class to carry it on. Resistance to some effects of Capitalism might temporarily result in reducing the Capitalist system to a greater or less degree of chaos (with consequent aggravated suffering for the working class), but the bringing of chaos is not the bringing of Socialism.

In any event, the outcome of such resistance depends always on the Capitalist class themselves. They have the choice either to give way to the particular demand which unites the workers, or to resist. The discontent of people who want only some reform of Capitalism, or any-

thing less than Socialism, can be bought off by granting what they want, and thus destroying the very platform on which this non-Socialist working class is united. The Capitalist class are not so blind or foolish that they will in the long run endanger their system by withholding the concessions necessary from time to time to bring off or side-track working class discontent.

Our correspondent also forgets one very important thing. Soldiers may be politically ignorant, but they are not ignorant of the science and art of organised coercion by violent means. After the politically ignorant workers have voted control of the machinery of government and the armed forces into the hands of the Capitalist class and their agents, it is nothing but madness to talk of waging a "violent struggle" against those who have a monopoly of the weapons and forces of violence.

Our correspondent's third point concerns resistance to war:—

If, as a result of national economic rivalry, war occurred in the course of which spontaneous opposition is given by the workers (though not intellectually understanding Socialism) and a change is desired by them, could not the situation culminate in the overthrow of the dominant class and the laying of the "foundation for the sway of the proletariat," if the mass feeling is correctly led?

This point is really a particular aspect of point Number two. Resistance to war is not resistance to Capitalism, and can always be removed in the last resort by stopping the war, leaving Capitalism intact. Furthermore, we suggest that instead of considering some hypothetical situation arising out of a hypothetical war, it would be more instructive to consider the war of 1914. In August, 1914, far from there being "spontaneous opposition," the working class in the overwhelming majority, owing to their political ignorance, were enthusiastic supporters of their respective sections of the Capitalist class, and if they had been otherwise there were Capitalist politicians (e.g., Lloyd George, Lord Morley, John Burns) ready and willing to lead the opposition to war. Our correspondent talks about "correctly leading" the "mass feeling" of the workers, but does not tell us how workers who still accept Capitalism and Capitalist leaders are to be induced to forsake them and follow people, whose general principles they reject, into a struggle for Socialism which they do not understand and do not want.

It is true that towards the end of the war the workers were becoming war-weary. But did they in fact do what our correspondent suggests? Did they overthrow Capitalism? On the contrary, in every country, not excepting Russia, the great majority of votes were cast at the first general elections not for Socialism, but for Capitalist parties of one kind or another. These are facts which show our correspondent's hypothesis to be fantastic.

Finally, our correspondent writes about workers not "understanding Socialism," but laying the "foundation for the sway of the proletariat." Does he really believe that workers who still vote for Capitalism are capable of acting as a ruling class? You do not change the character of the workers by changing the labels of their leaders.

The fourth point concerns democratic methods. Our correspondent writes:—

Is not democracy being superseded when capitalist crises occur—by capitalist force; witness events after the war. Hungary, Italy, etc. At present the threatening *coup d'état* by the Weimwehr in Austria.

Our correspondent asks, "Is not democracy being superseded . . . by Capitalist force?" His question shows that he has failed to understand what is the meaning of democracy, and what is the Socialist argument in favour of democratic methods. The use of force by the Capitalists who have been placed in power by the electors is not a supersession of democracy; it is as democratic as any other use of their power. It is not peculiar to the after-war period. Has our correspondent forgotten the brutal crushing of the Commune of Paris, in 1871, or the use of armed forces against the workers at Tonypany and elsewhere?

The Socialist's argument is that it is control of the machinery of Government which puts the Capitalist class in a position to compel obedience from any section of society. Those who control the political machinery, including the armed forces, are in a dominant position and literally their word is law, which they can enforce if need be by the methods of armed force. While the working class continue to be politically ignorant they will continue to vote into control of the political machinery parties which will use their power for the maintenance of Capitalism. The workers will not act differently until they become Socialists. Then they will use their votes to

secure political control for themselves instead of handing it to the Capitalists and their agents. There is no other way under the conditions of modern Capitalism by which the workers can gain political control. Attempts to organise armed attacks on the Capitalist-controlled armed forces are foredoomed to failure. Therefore Socialists oppose them.

When our correspondent refers to Hungary, Italy, Austria, etc., he fails to see that these cases bear out our statement that control of the political machinery is the deciding factor, enabling the Capitalists to coerce their opponents. For example, as has often been pointed out in these columns, Mussolini's forces were financed, armed, and allowed to organise by successive Governments democratically elected to power by the votes of the Italian electorate. Far from crushing him, as they easily could have done, they deliberately chose to place him at the head of the State.

In Austria now the Heimwehr have no power or importance except to the extent that they are aided by the forces of the Government. If they are now placed in charge it will be by the deliberate act of the present Government, which owes its position to having been voted into political control. To repeat our main argument: those in control of the political machinery are able to impose their will and alter the constitution as they may think fit. That is why the workers must gain political control which they can only do in the advanced capitalist countries by means of the vote.

ED. COMM.

S.P.G.B. PROPAGANDA MEETINGS

LONDON DISTRICT.	
Sunday	Head Office, 42 Great Dover Street, S.E.1. 8 p.m. Clapham Common, 11 a.m. Tottenham, West Green Corner, 11.30 a.m. Victoria Park, 11.30 a.m. Paddington, Prince of Wales, 11.30 a.m.
Wednesdays	Forest Gate Station, 8 p.m.
HANLEY BRANCH.	
Sundays	Hanley Market Square, 7 p.m. Burslem, St. John Square, 7 p.m.
GLASGOW BRANCH.	
Sundays	West Regent Street, 7.15 p.m.

YOUR Newsagent can obtain this journal from
Wholesale Agents: W. H. Smith & Son, Strand
House, W.C.

BRANCH DIRECTORY.

BATTERSEA.—Sec., 2, Hanbury-road, S.W.11. Branch meets Thursday, 8.30 p.m. at The Waiting Room, Latchmere Baths, entrance in Burns-road. Discussion second Thurs. in month.

BECONTREE.—Sec., Hy. Gratton, 4, Drummond Ave., Brooklands, Romford. Branch meets 1st and 3rd Wednesdays at 7.30, at above address.

BIRMINGHAM.—Sec., E. Jesper, 82, Rollason-rd., Edington. Branch meets The Continental Cafe, Moor St., 1st and 3rd Sundays at 11 a.m.

CENTRAL.—Membership obtained only through the Ex. Committee. Applications to General Sec.

EAST LONDON.—Sec. W. E. McHaffie. Communications to Secretary, S.P.G.B., c/o 141 Bow Road. Branch meets every Friday at 8 p.m. at above address. Discussion after Branch business. Public invited.

GLASGOW.—Branch meets Friday, 8 p.m., at Herald League Book Stall, 39, Shuttle Street, Glasgow. A. Shaw, 118, Henderson Street, Glasgow, C.I.

HACKNEY.—Branch meets Arcadian Cafe, 42, Amherst Road, Hackney, 1st and 3rd Mondays in month, 8 p.m., Discussions 9.30. Communication to Sec. as above.

HANLEY.—Branch meets Tuesdays, Working Men's Club, Glass-st.

ISLINGTON.—Branch meets Wednesdays, 8.30, at 144, Seven Sisters-rd., Holloway, N. Sec., A. Baker, 18, Orpingley Road, N.7.

LEYTON.—Sec., 396, Lea Bridge-rd., Leyton. Branch meets 8 p.m., Trades and Labour Hall, Grove House, High-rd., second Mondays in month.

MANCHESTER.—Sec., W. Addison, 111, West Park-street, Salford, Manchester. Branch meets 1st and 3rd Thursdays in month, 7.45 p.m.

PADDINGTON.—Branch meeting held on 2nd and 4th Fridays, 8 p.m., in room above the Co-operative Stores, 306, Kilburn Lane, W.9 (side door).

SOUTHEND-ON-SEA.—Sec., J. Bird, 5, Welling-ton-avenue, Westcliffe-on-Sea.

SOUTHWARK.—Branch meets Fridays at 8 p.m., 42, Great Dover Street, S.E.1. Communications to Sec., at above address.

TOOTING.—Sec., E. Carnell, 110, Beechcroft Rd., S.W.17. Branch meets Thursdays, 7.30 p.m. Lecture last Thursday in month, at Tooting Adult School, 971, Garratt Lane, S.W.17.

TOTTENHAM.—Secretary, 18, Woodlands Park Rd., N.15. Branch meets Fridays, Room 2, Trades Hall, 7, Bruce Grove, Discussion after branch business. Public invited.

WALTHAMSTOW.—Sec. S. E. Williams, 64, Bloxham-rd., Leyton, E.10. Branch meets at Workmen's Hall, High-st., every Monday.

WATFORD.—A. Lawson, Sec., 107, Kensington-avenue, Watford. Branch meets Mondays at 8.30 p.m. at Secretary's address.

WEST HAM.—Branch meets Thursdays at 8 p.m. at 167, Romford-rd., Stratford. Sec., P. Hallard, 22, Colegrave-rd., Stratford, E.

WOOD GREEN.—All communications to Sec., F. W. Godfrey, 71, Falkland Road, N.8. Branch meets 2nd and 4th Monday in month at 242, High Road, 8.30 p.m.

WOOLWICH.—Communications to Secretary at Head Office.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN.

OBJECT.—The establishment of a system of society based upon the common ownership and democratic control of the means and instruments for producing and distributing wealth by and in the interests of the whole community.

DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain HOLDS—

That society as at present constituted is based upon the ownership of the means of living (i.e., lands, factories, railways, etc.) by the capitalist or master class, and the consequent enslavement of the working class by whose labour alone wealth is produced.

That in society, therefore, there is an antagonism of interests, manifesting itself as a class struggle, between those who possess but do not produce and those who produce but do not possess.

That this antagonism can be abolished only by the emancipation of the working class from the domination of the master class, by the conversion into the common property of society of the means of production and distribution, and their democratic control by the whole people.

That as in the order of social evolution the working class is the last class to achieve its freedom, the emancipation of the working class will involve the emancipation of all mankind, without distinction of race or sex.

That this emancipation must be the work of the working class itself.

That as the machinery of government, including the armed forces of the nation, exists only to conserve the monopoly by the capitalist class of the wealth taken from the workers, the working class must organise consciously and politically for the conquest of the powers of government, national and local, in order that this machinery, including these forces, may be converted from an instrument of oppression into the agent of emancipation and the overthrow of privilege, aristocratic and plutocratic.

That as political parties are but the expression of class interests, and as the interest of the working class is diametrically opposed to the interests of all sections of the master class, the party seeking working-class emancipation must be hostile to every other party.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain, therefore, enters the field of political action determined to wage war against all other political parties, whether alleged labour or avowedly capitalist, and calls upon the members of the working class of this country to muster under its banner to the end that a speedy termination may be wrought to the system which deprives them of the fruits of their labour, and that poverty may give place to comfort, privilege to equality, and slavery to freedom.

Those agreeing with the above principles and desiring enrolment in the Party should apply for membership form to secretary of nearest branch or at Head Office.